The Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association

Revue de l'Association Canadienne de Linguistique

CONTENTS / SOMMAIRE

The Journal of the Canadian Linguistic Association

Revue de l'Association Canadienne de Linguistique

•

CONTENTS / SOMMAIRE

VARIA

¶ *Le IXe Congrès international des linguistes* doit se tenir aux Etats-Unis en 1962; l'événement est considérable et mérite de retenir dès maintenant l'attention de nos collègues, dont beaucoup ont été empêchés, par des considérations de distance et de prix, d'assister au VIIIe congrès d'Oslo (Cf. *JCLA/RACL* III. 2: 90-91, compte-rendu de W. F. Mackey). Nous espérons que la linguistique canadienne sera abondamment représentée.

Aux dernières nouvelles, nous apprenons que le président du IXe congrès, le professeur Joshua Whatmough, a déjà pressenti plusieurs de nos collègues, dont W. F. Mackey et J.-P. Vinay, pour faire partie du comité nord-américain d'organisation. D'ores et déjà, ces deux membres seront heureux de recevoir des suggestions sur le Congrès et des propositions de communication.

¶ The University of Alberta welcomes to its campus participants in the *Third Summer School of Linguistics* conducted under the joint sponsorship of the University and the Canadian Linguistic Association. It seems appropriate indeed that such a program should be conducted at a university where other linguistic projects have been or are being carried out, where in particular a program of linguistic studies leading towards an M.A. degree has recently been established. The *Journal* is elsewhere carrying an announcement of the Summer School. Our most sincere wishes are proferred to its director, Dr. E. Reinhold.

¶ La Section de Linguistique de l'Université de Montréal désire retenir dès maintenant la date de juillet-août 1961 pour sa *IIe Ecole d'été en Linguistique*; on sait qu'elle tint en 1956 sa première session qui fut très encourageante. Depuis, il se donne chaque année de 5 à 7 cours portant sur différentes disciplines de la linguistique. En 1961, des professeurs invités canadiens et européens traiteront notamment de syntaxe structurale, de la phonologie de l'anglo-canadien, et de stylistique. Environ un tiers des cours se donnera en anglais.

¶ Nous apprenons la mort toute récente de G. Guillaume, professeur à l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes de Paris, auteur de nombreux ouvrages sur la « linguistique de position » ou psycho-linguistique. Penseur profondément original, il laisse une doctrine très élaborée dont l'exploration semble bien assurée grâce à la présence parmi nous de son principal disciple, le professeur Roch Valin de l'Université Laval. Il est heureux, dans cette conjoncture, de constater que si M. Guillaume a souvent souffert durant sa vie d'une incompréhension ou d'un manque d'attention de la part des théoriciens de la linguistique, son oeuvre va continuer à s'épanouir dans les travaux de notre collègue, que nous assurons ici de notre cordiale sympathie.

¶ Following the organizational meeting in Winnipeg of the *Linguistic Circle of Manitoba and North Dakota* on March 30, 1959, a regular meeting was held in Grand Forks on May 15-16. A great many papers were read on this occasion; abstracts of them are presented in a first issue of the *Proceedings* (Vol. I No. 1, May 1959), with further contributions promised for the near future. The officers for 1959 are Demetrius J. Georgacas,

University of North Dakota, *President*; G. P. Goold, University of Manitoba, *Vice-President*; Norman B. Levin, University of North Dakota, *Secretary-Treasurer.*

¶ M. l'abbé René Charbonneau, professeur à la Section de Linguistique de l'Université de Montréal, a été invité à représenter le Canada auprès du Comité d'organisation du *Congrès international de dialectologie* (Section du français au Canada), qui se tiendra à Bruxelles et à Louvain en août 1960. M. Charbonneau présentera un rapport sur la place actuelle des études romanes au Canada.

¶ The delegate for Canada in the field of Anglo-Canadian linguistics to the Brussels Congress is Walter S. Avis, from RMC, Kingston. With two of our members presenting papers on Canadian subjects, dialectologists should become thoroughly interested in our area. Details of the forthcoming Congress may be obtained from the *Centre international de Dialectologie générale* (Prof. Sever Pop), 185 avenue des Alliés, Louvain, Belgique.

¶ *Le Collège de l'Assomption* (P.Q.) vient d'inaugurer l'un des laboratoires de langues les plus modernes de la province. Comptant 40 unités, il permet à 400 élèves d'y travailler chaque semaine sur des textes d'anglais et de français. Le Collège invite cordialement les linguistes canadiens de passage à Montréal à rendre visite à ce laboratoire.

¶ The *Journal* receives at frequent intervals a publication from the *Center of Applied Linguistics* of MLA, whose address is 1785 Massachusetts Ave., NW., Washington 6, D.C. The information contained in this Bulletin is both varied and interesting; Canadian news appears, often without having been supplied by the authors themselves. This publication is a useful clearing house for linguists. Our only objection to it is that it comes rolled up so tightly that it never recovers its original shape and is therefore difficult to file.

¶ The *Linguistic Society of the University of Toronto* held two meetings during the Autumn term. At its first meeting a paper was read by Dr. R. H. Robinson of the Dept. of East Asiatic Studies on « Transformations in Chinese Grammar ». Dr. C. D. Ellis of the Dept. of Anthropology, whose study on the tagmatic analysis of Cree is found elsewhere in this issue, presented the second paper entitled « On Defining the Phoneme ».

¶ The Department of Anthropology at the University of Toronto, under the auspices of the School of Graduate Studies, sponsored a public lecture by Prof. C. F. Hockett of Cornell University on « Grammar Minus Zero »; Prof. Hockett also addressed the Anthropology Club and the Linguistic Society on « Grammar and the Hearer ».

¶ Pending the publication of a *Style Sheet* which is in preparation, the Editors would like to stress the following points: Manuscripts should be submitted in English or French, typed in duplicate, on good quality paper (so that notations in ink may stand out), and double-spaced throughout; all footnotes should be placed at the end of the article.

When making phonetic or phonemic notations remember NOT to use phonetic symbols in the title, and carefully observe the following conventional practices: phonetic transcriptions appear between square brackets, phonemic transcriptions between virgules, spelling is underlined (to be printed in italics), and translations appear between inverted commas; words which are to be printed in small caps should be underlined with a wavy line, those to be printed in bold face should be underlined with a double line.

When making phonetic transcriptions it is often simpler to leave a blank and fill in the phonetic symbols by hand later, unless you have access to a phonetic typewriter (*Varityper* has a complete IPA alphabet, and many firms will change the old key on your typewriter to a phonetic symbol for a reasonable charge.) When filling in phonetic transcriptions by hand, be sure to use a ball point pen or a hard pencil, and carefully to draw each letter without making any variants or allographs which would puzzle the printer and result in errors. Until now most papers containing phonetic symbols were so poorly prepared that the editors have been forced to retype them in order to facilitate the work of the typesetter. Since this is an undesirable situation we strongly urge our contributors to refer to the new list of symbols which appears at the end of this issue; each symbol is accompanied by number (a different one for each size) which can be noted in the margin, in pencil; when a symbol is difficult to recognize, this will serve as a foolproof reference for the typesetter. This list supersedes that published in *JCLA/RACL* 4.2 (1958): 110.

¶ Our contributors to the present issue are DR. DOUGLAS ELLIS, lecturer in the Department of Anthropology at the University of Toronto; DR. ROBERT LADO, Director of the English Language Institute at the University of Michigan; Dr. Lado is a recognized authority on Language Testing; DR. JAMES E. LA FOLLETTE, Assistant Professor of French at the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.; DR. YAO SHEN, Associate Professor of Chinese and English in the Department of Far Eastern Languages and Literature at the University of Michigan; MME IRÈNE VACHON-SPILKA, Lecturer in French in the Extension Department at the Université de Montréal.

●

UNIVERSITÉ DE MONTRÉAL — FACULTÉ DES LETTRES

Cours de Vacances en Linguistique

(Session ordinaire) [1]

4 juillet - 17 août 1960

(1) Cours de phonétique, morphologie et stylistique du français

(Section élémentaire et intermédiaire) :
MM. R. Charbonneau, E. Hug, Mme I. Vachon-Spilka, Mlle R. Legris.

(2) Cours de Maîtrise ès Arts :

Stylistique et traduction littéraire	*A. Champroux*
Syntaxe du français, (1) la langue du XVIIe siècle	*Y. Courteville*
Syntaxe du français, (2) le subjonctif en français moderne	*Y. Courteville*
Grammaire supérieure du français moderne	*E. Richer, S.J.*
Méthodologie de la recherche linguistique	*G. R. Lefebvre*
Phonologie du français moderne	*G. R. Lefebvre*

[1] Pour tous renseignements, communiquer avec l'Extension de l'Enseignement, C. P. 6128, Université de Montréal, P. Q.

●

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
SUMMER SCHOOL OF LINGUISTICS

sponsored jointly by
The University and The Canadian Linguistic Association

July 4th - August 13th 1960

History of the English Language	*W. Hirtle*
Modern English Grammar	*R. J. Baker*
Romance Philology	*E. von Richthoffen*
General Linguistics	*C. F. Hockett*
Phonetics and Phonemics	*J. C. Street*
Morphology and Syntax	*J. C. Street*
English Phonetics	*R. J. Baker*
French Phonetics	*R. G. Motut*
Field Methods in Linguistics	*C. D. Ellis*
Culture and Language	*G. K. Hirabayashi and J. Lessard*

¶ All inquiries concerning the Summer School of Linguistics should be directed to Dr. E. Reinhold, Director, Summer School of Linguistics, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta.

A GRAMMATICAL CONTRAST AND ITS SIGNALS IN MANDARIN CHINESE AND IN ENGLISH[1]

Yao Shen, University of Michigan

Let us consider two lists of Chinese words in Mandarin Chinese, the spoken National language. (In this article the writer is also the informant). According to their syntactic functions, we shall call the words in one of these lists "nouns",[2] and those in the other list "verbs".[3]

Examples of nouns are : gou³ *'dogs'*[4]; ji¹ *'chickens'*; wu¹dz *'rooms'*; tsai⁴ *'vegetables, dishes (of food)'*[5]. Examples of verbs are: jiau⁴ *'bark, call'*[6]; chr¹ *'eat'*; hei¹ *'dark, are dark'*[7]; tian² *'sweet, are sweet'*. In Chinese, there are sentences consisting of a noun followed by a verb. We shall call such sentences S = N V. Examples are: gou³ jiau⁴ *'Dogs bark.'*; ji¹ chr¹ *'Chickens eat.'*;[8] wu¹dz hei¹ *'Rooms are dark.'*; tsai⁴ tian² *'Vegetable are sweet; dishes (of food) are sweet.'*. There are also parts of sentences in Chinese consisting of a verb followed by a noun. We shall call the formula for such "verb noun" sentence parts[9] V N. Examples are: jiau⁴ gou³ *'call dogs'*; chr¹ ji¹ *'eat chickens'*; hei¹ wu¹dz *'darkrooms'*; tian² tsai⁴ *'desserts'*.

---

[1] Part of this article was presented as a paper delivered at the 11th University of Kentucky Foreign Language Conference, 1958. I am grateful to the constructive suggestions of Fang Kuei Li, W. F. Twaddell, J. W. Wevers and R. H. Robinson.

[2] "A *noun* is a syntactic word which can be placed in apposition with a D-AN compound, as *ren* in *jeyg ren* 'this man,' *shoei* in *i-bei shoei* 'a cup of water,' *yan in leang-jin yan* (or *yan leang-jin* in bookkeeping style) 'two catties of salt.'" Y. R. Chao, *Mandarin Primer* (Mass. Harvard University Press, 1948), p. 46.

[3] "A *verb* is a syntactic word which can be modified by the adverb *bu* (except that the verb *yeou* takes *mei*) and can be followed by the phrase suffix .le." *Ibid.*, p. 47.

[4] In Chinese, gou³ is both *'dog'* and *'dogs'*. The English plural form is used to translate gou³.

[5] Y. R. Chao and L. S. Yang, *A Concise Dictionary of Spoken Chinese* (Mass. Harvard University Press, 1947), p. 185.

[6] In Chinese, hei¹ is 'am dark', 'is dark', and 'are dark'. The English plural form is used to translate hei¹.

[7] In Chinese, jiau⁴ is 'bark' and 'barks'. The English non-third person singular is used to translate jiau⁴.

[8] This is Fang Kuei Li's example of ambiguity in Chinese. It means "chickens eat" as well as "chickens to be eaten". Only the first meaning is used here.

The formula N V is further distinguished from the formula V N in that there is an expansion of the formula V N with *de* which is not found with the formula N V. The expanded formula of V N is V de N. Examples are: jiau⁴ de gou³ *'dogs that bark'*; chr¹ de ji¹ *'chickens that eat'*[10]; hei¹ de wu¹dz *'rooms that are dark'*; tian² de tsai⁴ *'vegetables, dishes (of food) that are sweet'*.

Not only is V N distinguished from N V in that V N can be expanded to V de N; there are two classes of V N. One class may be preceded by N and becomes N V N; the other class is not found to be preceded by N. We shall call the first class V₁ N and the second class V₂ N. Examples are :

V₁ N	N V N
jiau⁴ gou³ *'sall dogs'*	ren² jiau⁴ gou³ *'People call dogs.'*
chr¹ ji¹ *'eat chickens'*	ren² chr¹ ji¹ *'People eat chickens'*
V₂ N	
hei¹ wu¹dz *'darkrooms'*	
tian² tsai⁴ *'desserts'*	

There are also two classes of V de N. One class may be preceded by N and becomes N V de N; the other class is not found to be preceded by N. We shall call the first class V₁ de N and the second class V₂ de N. Examples are :

V₁ de N	N V de N
jiau⁴ de gou³ *'dogs that bark'*	ren² jiau⁴ de gou³ *'dogs that people call'*
chr¹ de ji¹ *'chickens that eat'*	ren² chr¹ de ji¹ *'chickens that people eat'*
V₂ de N	
hei¹ de wu¹dz *'rooms that are dark'*[11]	
tian² de tsai⁴ *'vegetables, dishes (of food) that are sweet'*[12]	

---

⁹ The first two examples of V N are imperatives. These V N also may precede a verb, follow a noun or a verb, or both. The last two examples of V N are not imperatives. These V N may precede a verb or follow a verb or both.

¹⁰ jiau⁴ de gou³ means *'dogs that bark'* as well as *'dogs that are called'* and chr¹ de ji¹ means *'chickens that eat'* as well as *'chickens that are eaten'*. Only the first meaning in each instance is used here.

¹¹ As in li³tou hei¹ de wu¹dz *'rooms that are dark inside'*. li³tou hei¹ de wu¹dz is not an expansion of li³tou hei¹ wu¹dz. Li³tou hei¹ wu¹dz is not a construction.

¹² As in kou³ wei⁴ tian² de tsai⁴ *'vegetables, dishes (of food) that are sweet'*. kou³ wei⁴ tian² de tsai⁴ is not an expansion of kou³ wei⁴ tian² tsai⁴. Kou³ wei⁴ tian² tsai⁴ is not a construction.

V_1 and V_2 are further distinguished from each other in that both the referential meaning and the form of V_1 N are different from those of V_1 de N, while the referential meaning of V_2 N and V_2 de N may be similar[13] or may be different, but the forms are grammatically different entities. Examples are :

V_1 N		V_1 de N	
jiau⁴ gou³	*'call dogs'*	jiau⁴ de gou³	*'dogs that bark'*
chr¹ ji¹	*'eat chickens'*	chr¹ de ji¹	*'chickens that eat'*

V_2 N		V_2 de N	
hei¹ wu¹dz	*'darkrooms'*	hei¹ de wu¹dz	*'rooms that are dark'*
tian² tsai⁴	*'desserts'*	tian² de tsai⁴	*'vegetables, dishes (of food) that are sweet'*

Our main interest here is the grammatical difference between V_2 N and V_2 de N.

In teaching foreign languages (in this case, Chinese to English speakers), BOTH meaning AND form must be taught. Meaning here is easy to get across, since that of the unexpanded form and the expanded form may be similar. The difference in form is not hard to teach either. V_2 N has no insertions; V_2 de N has an insertion. But it is taxing for the English-speaking student to react to the uninserted form as a grammatical entity different from the inserted one. Our immediate question is: What teaching techniques can we apply to help students get the difference ?

One technique in language teaching which seldom fails is called "from the known to the unknown". If we look at English, we find that there is a list of words which occur successively before the words of another list. We shall call the first English list "adjectives", and the second English list "nouns". Examples of the adjectives are: "dark"; "hot". Examples of the nouns are: "room"; "rod".

In English we have three formulas, consisting of an adjective followed by a noun. Furthermore, in English it is not enough to give a formula like "A N". It is necessary to specify what kind of stress is on the adjective and what kind of stress is on the noun.

Let us consider two stress patterns : [′ `] and [^ ′]. Both stress patterns occur with A N words :

[′ `]	[^ ′]
darkroom	dark room
hotrod	hot rod

---

13 "Similar" = "compatible", here and later in the paper, refers to meanings.

In English, there is also an expansion of A N: A-ish N with [ˆ ']. Examples are : "darkish room"; "hottish rod".

The three expanded and unexpanded formulas for English A Nare : 'A 'N, ˆA 'N, ˆA-ish 'N.

The referential meanings of ˆA 'N and ˆA-ish 'N may be similar. Examples are :

ˆA 'N	ˆA-ish 'N
dark room	darkish room
hot rod	hottish rod

But the referential meaning of 'A 'N is different from that of ˆA 'N or ˆA-ish 'N. Examples are :

'A 'N	ˆA 'N	ˆA-ish 'N
darkroom	dark room	darkish room
hotrod	hot rod	hottish rod

Putting the students' foreign language (Chinese) and their native language (English) side by side, we find there are two formulas in Chinese and three in English.

	Chinese :	English :	
referential meanings may be similar	V_2 N → unexpanded ←	'A 'N ˆA 'N	referential meanings are different
	V_2 de N → expanded ←	ˆA-ish 'N	referential meanings may be similar

In both languages, there are the overt features of non-expansion and expansion. In Chinese the referential meanings of the unexpanded and of the expanded formulas may be similar. In English, the referential meanings of the two unexpanded formulas with DIFFERENT stress patterns are DIFFERENT, and the referential meanings of the unexpanded and the expanded formulas with the SAME stress pattern may be SIMILAR.

Grammatically speaking, in Chinese, the unexpanded formula is a "nominal compound", and the expanded one is an "adjective noun" phrase. In English, ' + ` is the "nominal compound", and ˆ + ', with or without "ish"-insertion, is the "adjective noun" phrase.

Chinese :			English :	
nominal compound	$\{ \begin{matrix} V_2 \, N \\ hei^1 \; wu^1dz \end{matrix}$	$\}$ unexpanded	$\left[\begin{matrix} 'A \; 'N \\ dárkr`oom \end{matrix} \right.$	$\left. \begin{matrix} \\ \\ \end{matrix} \right\}$ adjective nominal compound
			$\left[\begin{matrix} \hat{}A \; 'N \\ dârk \; róom \end{matrix} \right.$	
adjective noun	$\{ \begin{matrix} V_2 \, de \, N \\ hei^1 \; de \; wu^1dz \end{matrix}$	$\}$ expanded	$\{ \begin{matrix} \hat{}A\text{-ish} \; 'N \\ dârkish \; róom \end{matrix}$	$\}$ noun

However, the "ish-insertion may be used to remind the English speaker learning Chinese of the similar referential meanings of the expanded Chinese formula, which is an "adjective noun" phrase. Thus we cannot go directly from the known in English to the unknown in Chinese.

There is another pair of lists of Chinese and English words; we shall call them "Chinese intensifiers = *(Ch) Int*", and "English intensifiers = *(E) Int*". Examples of Chinese intensifiers : hen³ *'very'*; *'geng'*; *'more'*; examples of English intensifiers : "extremely"; "quite".

(Ch) Int does not occur successively before nouns, nor does *(E) Int* occur successively before nouns. In Chinese, V_2 N functions as a noun; it does not occur after intensifiers. In English, 'A 'N functions as a noun, and it does not occur after intensifiers.

On the other hand, *(Ch) Int* occurs before V_2 de N (but not V_1 de N). For example: hen³ hei¹ de wu¹dz *'rooms that are very dark'*; geng⁴ tian² de tsai⁴ *'vegetables, dishes (of food) that are sweeter'*. *(E) Int* occurs before ^A 'N. For example: "extremely dârk róom"; "quite hôt ród".

There is a parallelism between *(Ch) Int* and *(E) Int*. In Chinese, *Int* does not occur before V_2 N but does occur before V_2 de N. In English, *Int* does not occur before 'A 'N but does occur before ^A 'N. Our formulas are :

Chinese :		English :
V_2 N (hei¹ wu¹dz	*'darkrooms'*)	'A 'N (dárkro`om)
V_2 de N (hei¹ de wu¹dz	*'rooms that are dark'*	^A 'N (dârk róom)
Int V_2 de N		*Int* ^A 'N (extremely
(hen³ hei¹ de wu¹dz	*'rooms that are very dark'*)	dârk róom)

For native speakers of English, the function of *Int* in English can serve as an effective means to understand the function of *Int* in Chinese. The functions are similar :

Int ˆA 'N = Int V_2 de N.

Furthermore, *(E) Int* and *(Ch) Int* show the parallelism between ˆA 'N and V_2 de N; the former two can occur before the latter two respectively. They also show the parallelism between 'A 'N and V_2 N; they may not occur before the latter two.

The parallelisms now are :

ˆA 'N = V_2 de N

'A 'N = V_2 N

Just as 'A 'N is different from ˆA 'N in English, so is V_2 N different from V_2 de N in Chinese.

English : 'A 'N # ˆA 'N

Chinese : V_2 N # V_2 de N

In English, 'A 'N is a "nominal compound", and ˆA 'N is an "adjective noun phrase".

In Chinese, V_2 N is a "nominal compound", and V_2 de N is an "adjective noun phrase".

	nominal compound		adjective noun
Chinese :	'A 'N	#	ˆA N'
English :	V_2 N	#	V_2 de N

We can also arrange the relationship in another way.

| 'A 'N | ⟶ | nominal compound | ⟵ | V_2 N |
| ˆA 'N | ⟶ | adjective noun | ⟵ | V_2 de N |

In English, the difference between a "nominal compound" and an "adjective noun phrase" is signalled by the stress patterns; in Chinese, the difference is signalled by the insertion of *de*.

By using "the known" — the similar function of *Int* in English and *Int* in Chinese — to teach "an unknown" — a grammatical contrast signalled differently in English and in Chinese, the teacher can show the native speakers of English this difference in Chinese less painfully and more effectively.

The use of "from the known to the unknown" is usually effective in the teaching of a foreign language. It is, nevertheless, essential that between the two the difference should be minimal. *de* in Chinese and *–ish* in English are both expansions. But minus the *de* in V_2 de N in Chinese, the rest is V_2 N; and minus the *–ish* in ˆA*–ish* 'N in English, the rest is not only A N but also [ˆ ']. Thus the difference is not minimal. On the other hand, there seems to be no parallelism between the *de* in V_2 de N and the [ˆ '] in ˆA 'N. In Chinese, *de* is a successive expansion; in

English, [ˆ ´] is a stress pattern and a co-occurrence. But by using the similar function of *(Ch) Int* and *(E) Int* the teacher can point out V_2 N — ′A ′N and V_2 de N — ˆA ′N as grammatical parallelisms. In the same way, he can show V_2 N # V_2 de N and ′A ′N # ˆA ′N as similar grammatical contrasts. The difference here is minimal. And it is this kind of use of "from the known to the unknown" that usually brings effective teaching of a foreign language.[14]

•

---

[14] In the transcription the superscript numerals indicate the tone of the preceding syllable. The tones are, respectively, (1) high level, (2) high rising, (3) low and (4) high falling.

QUELQUES CADRES DU FRANÇAIS MODERNE

Irène Vachon-Spilka, Université de Montréal

0. — Dans l'espoir d'apporter un peu d'ordre aux "règles" des grammaires traditionnelles et de fournir aux étudiants étrangers une explication facilement assimilable des cadres les plus fréquents de la prose française, nous avons commencé à appliquer la méthode des substitutions à quelques problèmes de morphologie avec des résultats qui nous ont paru satisfaisants dans leur application pédagogique.

Au cours de l'exposé qui va suivre, nous nous appliquerons à découvrir la situation précise du mot *de* dans la structure essentielle du français moderne, c'est-à-dire sans tenir compte des effets stylistiques ni des tournures archaïques égarées dans la langue contemporaine.

0.1 — Dans la liste des fréquences du français élémentaire dressée par Gougenheim, Rivenc, Michéa et Sauvageot[1], *de* se place au troisième rang; d'autre part, William N. Locke[2] calcule que *de, du, de l', de la, des*, qu'il met dans un même article, apparaissent en moyenne 54.0 fois par 1000, ce qui les placerait au second rang des fréquences. Quoi qu'il en soit, *de* s'impose à l'attention des élèves dès les premières leçons de français et exige des explications aussi claires que précises.

Nous savons empiriquement que le petit mot *de*, ou mieux l'ensemble phonétique [d(ə)], recouvre plus d'une réalité grammaticale. Il a tantôt un sens propre facile à saisir; c'est alors ce que certains grammairiens appellent un "*de* plein"; tantôt il sert de ligature, de simple cheville ou joue un certain nombre de rôles mal définis; c'est le "*de* outil*". Sachant que *de* ne se trouve jamais en énoncé libre, nous pouvons présumer qu'il remplit des fonctions morphémiques diverses et dire que le donné brut [d(ə)] est un homomorphe {DE} dont nous chercherons à isoler les constituantes, c'est-à-dire les morphes {de}[1,2,3,n] qui se grammaticalisent en allomorphes {de}[n] rattachables à des archimorphèmes {{M}}.

---

[1] Gougenheim, G., Michéa, R., Rivenc, P. & Sauvageot, A., *L'Elaboration du français élémentaire*. Paris, Didier, 1956 : 63.

[2] Locke, William, N., *Scientific French*, Cambridge, The Technology Press of M.I.T., 1954 : 9.

0.2 – Nous ne retenons pas la variation *de* ⌐ *d'*, qui est une alternance automatique relevant de la morphophonologie et de la graphématique, mais qui ne joue aucun rôle morphémique.

Rappelons enfin que notre méthode s'appuie sur le principe des oppositions et que nous ne cherchons pas à définir mais à décrire.

1. – Le type d'énoncé # *pas* DE (*substantif*) # se présente fréquemment, soit sous forme d'énoncé libre: # *pas* DE *cigare* #, qui est une des réponses possibles à l'offre d'un cigare: # *un cigare ?* #, soit sous forme de segment d'énoncé: # *je n'ai* ‖ *pas* DE *cigare* ‖ *sur moi* #. Un autre exemple du même type serait # *pas* DE *cigarettes* # qui s'oppose à # *des cigarettes* # avec ou sans intonation interrogative, comme # *pas* DE *cigare* # s'oppose à # *un cigare* #, encore une fois avec ou sans interrogation. Nous sommes maintenant en présence de deux oppositions :

pas DE + S. *sing.* ⟷ UN + S. *sing.*

et

pas DE + S. *plur.* ⟷ DES + S. *plur.*

Mais en vérité ces quatre propositions s'opposent deux à deux, de sorte qu'il y a six oppositions possibles :

(1) *pas* DE + S. *sing.* ⟷ UN + S. *sing.* (2)

(3) *pas* DE + S. *plur.* ⟷ DES + S. *plur.* (4)

1.1 – Des exemples concrets illustreront mieux ces rapports :

(2-1)   UN *cigare, cher ami ?*
        Pas DE *cigare, cher ami ?*

(2-3)   *J'ai* UN *cigare.*
        Je n'ai pas DE *cigare.*

(2-4)   *Voulez-vous* UNE *cigarette ?*
        Voulez-vous DES *cigarettes ?*

(1-4)   *Je ne prends pas* DE *cigare.*
        Je prends DES *cigares.*

(1-3)   *Il n'a pas* DE *cigare.*
        Il n'a pas DE *cigares.*

(4-3)   DES *cigarettes ?*
        Pas DE *cigarettes ?*

On peut remplacer la négation *pas* par d'autres négations sans troubler ces oppositions :

DES *cigarettes* ⟷ | *pas*
                   | *jamais* | DE | *cigarettes*
                   | *plus*
                   | *point*

2. – Nous aurions donc pu dire plus haut : le type d'énoncé
#⟨négation⟩ DE (*substantif*)#. Or, on rencontre justement
un autre type d'énoncé de même articulation assez semblable
pour lui être comparé : #⟨quantité⟩ DE (*substantif*)#.

En procédant comme tout à l'heure, on s'aperçoit que non
seulement les types 1 et 2 s'opposent entre eux, mais encore
qu'ils s'opposent aux types # UN (*substantif*) #, # UNE
(*substantif*) #, # DES (*substantif*) #; en continuant systé-
matiquement, on arrive à réunir les types d'énoncés suivants,
dans lesquels il y a possibilité de substitution entre les ter-
mes appartenant à une même classe :

	UN	(*beau*)	*cigare*
	UNE	(*bonne*)	*cigarette*
	DES		*cigares*
			(*cigarettes*)
	DE	*beaux / bonnes*	*cigares /*
			cigarettes
pas (*&c.*)	DE	(*beau* (x)	*cigare* (s)
		(*bonne* (s))	(*cigarette* (s))
beaucoup (*&c.*)	DE	(*beaux*	*cigares*
		(*bonnes*))	(*cigarettes*)

Le tableau peut se lire ainsi :

    UN   précède un substantif ou un adjectif masculin;
    UNE précède un substantif ou un adjectif féminin;
    DES précède un substantif pluriel sans égard au genre;
    DE   précède tout adjectif pluriel;
          suit toute négation;
          suit toute expression de quantité.

2.1 – Résumons ces données dans un tableau synoptique où *a* re-
présente l'adjectif épithète affecté d'une catégorie, *A* tout
adjectif épithète, *s* le substantif affecté d'une catégorie, *S*
tout substantif, *N* toute expression de négation et *Q* toute
expression de quantité; le morphème demeure écrit en toutes
lettres :

TABLEAU I

1		UN	(*a.m.*)	*s.m.*
2		UNE	(*a.f.*)	*s.f.*
3		DES		*s. plur.*
4		DE	*a. plur.*	*s. plur.*
5	*N*	DE	(*A*)	*S*
6	*Q*	DE	(*a. plur.*)	*s. plur.*

2.2 – *S* a une présence constante, mais des formes variant en fonc-
tion des catégories nominales de genre et de nombre.

A est affecté par les variations formelles de *S*, sa présence est facultative dans les propositions 1, 2, 5 et 6; elle est fonctionnelle en 3 et 4.   Les termes *N* et *Q* ne se trouvent que devant la quatrième forme du morphème.

2.2 – Celui-ci présente en effet quatre formes dont trois sont des variations catégorielles: UN devant le masculin, UNE devant le féminin, DES devant le pluriel.   La quatrième forme DE est tactique et ses règles de substitution s'énoncent ainsi :

1   DE se substitue à DES devant un adjectif:

2   DE se substitue à UN, UNE, DES après une négation:

3   DE se substitue à DES après une expression de quantité.

2.3 – Nous pouvons maintenant postuler l'existence d'un archimorphème ⦃UN⦄ dont les allomorphes sont ⦃un⦄ ⦃une⦄ ⦃des⦄ ⦃de⦄, ce dernier étant le morphe ⦃de⦄[1] de l'homomorphe ⦃DE⦄.

3. – Examinons maintenant des énoncés du type #DE *la confiture*#, communément appelé ''partitif''.   En précédant comme pour ⦃UN⦄, on arrive au résultat suivant :

	DU ·	(*bon*)	*tabac*
	DE LA	(*bonne*)	*crème*
	DE L'	(*autre*)*	*eau* ‡
pas (&c.)	DE	(*bon*(*ne*))	*tabac* (*crème*)
beaucoup (&c.)	DE	(*bon*(*ne*))	*tabac* (*crème*)

Dressons un tableau synoptique dans lequel nous ne tiendrons pas compte de l'adjectif épithète puisque celui-ci, de toute évidence, ne joue aucun rôle qui intéresse notre problème.

Les symboles seront *s* pour les substantifs, *s.* (*v*) indiquant tout substantif qui commence par une voyelle ou une *h* aspirée, *N* toute expression négative et *Q* toute expression quantitative; le morphème sera écrit en toutes lettres.

TABLEAU II

1		DU	*s.m.*
2		DE LA	*s.f.*
3		DE L'	*s.* (*v*)
4	N	DE	*s. m/f.*
5	Q	DE	*s. m/f.*

---

* Ne pas confondre avec *d'autre* qui est équivalent à *différent*, alors que *de l'autre* équivaut à *de ce qui est distinct*.

‡ L'élision devant la voyelle est pertinente puisqu'elle occasionne une variation morphologique.

3.1 – Le morphème présente quatre formes, dont deux sont caté-
gorielles et deux tactiques: soit DU devant un substantif
masculin, DE LA devant un nom féminin, d'une part; DE L'
devant un substantif ou un adjectif commençant par une
voyelle ou une *h* aspirée, et DE après une expression néga-
tive ou une expression quantitative, d'autre part. On re-
marque que le substantif est toujours à la forme singulière.

3.2 – Il convient ici d'examiner une neutralisation gênante. La
proposition 4 du Tableau II semble à première vue identi-
que à la proposition 5 du Tableau I. Or, elles sont d'ori-
gine différente et ne doivent pas être confondues. # *Pas*
⊦de⊦ *cigarette(s)* # s'oppose à #⊦une⊦ *cigarette* # et à #⊦des⊦
cigarettes #, mais # *pas* ⊦de⊦ *crème* # s'oppose uniquement
à #⊦de la⊦ *crème* # d'une part; #*pas* ⊦de⊦ *cigarette(s)* #
et #⊦une⊦ *cigarette* # s'opposent à #*beaucoup* ⊦de⊦ *ciga-
rettes* #, mais #*pas* ⊦de⊦ *crème* # et ⊦de la⊦ *crème* # s'oppo-
sent à #*beaucoup* ⊦de⊦ *crème* #, d'autre part. En d'autres
termes ⊦un⊦ et ⊦une⊦ s'opposent à ⊦des⊦, c'est-à-dire
qu'ils ont un pluriel, mais ⊦du⊦ et ⊦de la⊦ ne s'opposent
pas à ⊦des⊦, c'est-à-dire qu'ils n'ont pas de pluriel. Cette
distinction est extrêmement importante, car ici la neutra-
lisation grammaticale recouvre une exclusion sémantique.
En effet ⊦⊦DU⊦⊦ *et* ⊦⊦UN⊦⊦ s'excluent mutuellement en vertu
du principe de congruence de Joos: #*un pain* # n'est pas
#*du pain* #, et *pain* est dans ces deux expressions un terme
différent, ainsi que le révèle la traduction: #*un pain* #
signifie #*a loaf* #; #*du pain* # signifie #*bread* #. On peut
dire #*des pains* ‖ (‖*de savon*, ‖*de sucre*, ‖*&c.*) quand *pain*
équivaut à #*loaf* #, mais jamais lorsqu'il veut dire #*bread* #.
Si les deux termes coïncident dans la langue, c'est par en-
tropie. Il est donc absolument faux d'enseigner, comme
le font la plupart des manuels de français à l'usage des
étrangers, que le partitif s'exprime au moyen de *du*, *de la*,
de l' et *des* avec, à l'appui, des démonstrations tirées du
vocabulaire alimentaire telles que: *Pour mon petit dé-
jeuner j'ai pris du café, de la crème et des oeufs*. Il suffit
d'un instant de réflexion pour se rendre compte qu'un
Français dirait: *"J'ai pris un oeuf"* mais pas *"J'ai pris de
l'oeuf"* !

4. – En conclusion on peut dire qu'il existe un archimorphème
⊦⊦DU⊦⊦ possédant quatre allormorphes: ⊦du⊦ ⊦de la⊦
⊦de l'⊦ ⊦de⊦ ce dernier étant le morphe ⊦de⊦[2] de l'homo-
morphe ⊦DE⊦.

4.1 – Il reste pourtant un point à éclaircir. Si on peut construire
#*j'ai du courage* # sur le modèle de #*j'ai du fromage* #, on
ne trouve pas dans la langue #*j'ai du grand courage* # alors

qu'on rencontre #*j'ai du bon fromage*#.   Seul #*un grand courage*# existe.   Pour expliquer cette variation, nous aurions aimé trouver un critère purement linguistique.   Nous sommes forcés d'avouer notre échec et de recourir, en attendant mieux, au critère sémantique.   Courage se rattache à une catégorie de noms "abstraits".   Or, on trouve le nom abstrait dans des énoncés avec ⟨⟨DU⟩⟩ quand il n'est pas qualifié, mais seulement avec ⟨⟨UN⟩⟩ lorsqu'il est en présence d'un adjectif épithète :

du courage	un grand courage	
de la patience	une patience angélique	
de l'héroïsme	un héroïsme peu commun	
	des	courages	rares
		patiences	
		héroïsmes	(3)

5. – Nous avons étudié jusqu'ici des *de* allomorphes rattachés à des archimorphèmes; leur valeur est toute grammaticale, ils n'ont en eux-mêmes d'autre valeur sémantique que celle de l'archimorphème. On rencontre pourtant, en français, un *de* à valeur sémantique, comparable aux morphèmes de subordination *à*, *pour*, &c. A-t-il une forme constante, ou bien subit-il des variations et quelles sont-elles? S'il est vrai que "plus un mot est d'emploi fréquent, plus il est irrégulier" nous sommes en droit d'attendre de nombreuses variations formelles dans le comportement du morphème *de*. Aussi jugeons-nous utile, au départ, de prendre un point de repère dont la régularité nous soit connue, soit ⟨vers⟩ qui se classe au 306e rang dans l'*Elaboration du français élémentaire*[1] et se construit invariablement avec toutes les marques nominales. Comparons lui les constructions du type #DE ⟨marque nominale⟩ (*substantif*)# :

VERS		DE	
	Paris	DE	Paris
	le jardin	DU	jardin
	la ville	DE	la ville
	l'île	DE	l'île
	les collines	DES	collines
	un endroit	D'	un endroit
	une rue	D'	une rue
	des chemins	•	des chemins
	mon (&c.) domaine	DE	mon (&c.) domaine
	ce (&c.) bois	DE	ce (&c.) bois

---

[3] Comme un très grand nombre de noms entrent dans cette classe, le problème est intéressant et exigerait une exploration systématique, mais celle-ci dépasserait les cadres du présent article.

5.1 – Nous sommes ici en présence de quatre variations: *de, du, des,* et *zéro* qui sont les allomorphes de l'archimorphème ⫤DE⫥. Toutes ces variations sont tactiques, puisque le morphème de subordination, en français, ne connaît pas de catégories ainsi qu'en témoignent ⟨vers⟩, ⟨pour⟩, &c. L'énoncé de ces variations est le suivant :

> DE précède les formes suivantes des marques nominales: *zéro, la, l', un, une, mon* (&c.) et *ce* (&c.) ;
>
> DU se substitue à : *de + le;*
>
> DES se substitue à : *de + les;*
> précède *des* (allomorphe de ⫤UN⫥).

Dans l'énoncé, les variations de ⫤DE⫥ produisent deux cas de neutralisation : (1) neutralisation de l'allomorphe ⟨des⟩ par ⫤DE⫥ + ⫤UN⫥ : *#j'ai fini des dentelles#* signifie également *#I have finished some pieces of lace / I am through with the lace#*; (2) neutralisation de l'allomorphe ⟨du⟩ provenant de ⫤DU⫥ avec l'allomorphe ⟨du⟩ provenant de ⫤DE⫥ lorsque le substantif est homoforme d'un nom de substance: si *#du jardin#* signifie sans ambiguïté *#from the garden#* *#de la terre#* peut-être *#from the earth / (some) earth#*.

<p align="center">(à suivre)</p>

<p align="center">●</p>

TESTING PROFICIENCY IN WRITING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE

Robert Lado, English Language Institute,
University of Michigan.

1. **Dearth of techniques; Confusion.**

Discussions of the testing of proficiency to write a foreign language are usually limited to techniques; and without a rationale or set criteria of what is to be tested, the result is confusion. Partly as a consequence of the lack of a rationale we are faced with a dearth of techniques in use. Essentially we find only two: objective short answer tests, which are distrusted, and composition tests, which are frustrating because of problems of scoring and the time involved.

Superficial clichés are freely applied to these two techniques. Judgments are made on outward appearances — face validity — without reference to linguistic content or to empirically tested validity. On the basis of appearance, objective tests are criticized because presumably (1) they do not force the student to think, (2) they do not require that the student organize and present information, (3) they are only recognition, multiple choice tests, (4) they are considered elementary in comparison with the business of writing a free composition in the foreign language.

Outside of the frustration and time involved in scoring compositions, these enjoy tremendous and widespread prestige not only as a test of writing but as a sign of intelligence, education, and academic achievement. The basis for this prestige is usually not questioned. Historically the ability to write has been the chief sign of learning, and even now to write and to publish are considered among the highest intellectual achievements. If questions are raised, the prestige itself is not given as the basis for the use of composition tests; rather, *a posteriori* reasons are adduced as for example (1) that they really force the student to show what he knows, (2) that they make him think, (3) that they force him to organize his knowledge, (4) that they deal with mature topics rather than with trivial detail, and (5) that they force the student to write, which is what we are trying to test. Disagreements and inconsistencies in scoring compositions are minimized or dismissed with the feeling that "others" may waiver in their scoring but "I" know what constitutes a superior composition.

All of these reasons and clichés, except perhaps that compositions are samples of a student's writing, are based on appearances, on face validity. If we are to measure writing skill with any precision and consistency we will have to consider critically the problem of validity of linguistic content and in some cases appeal to empirical validity as well. This paper discusses these criteria as they concern composition and objective tests of writing a foreign language. Much of the discussion applies also to tests of writing the native language, but the crucial problems to be tested are different and would require separate treatment.

2. Critical discussion of composition as a test of proficiency in writing.

At least four questions need to be asked of a test beyond mere appearances: (1) Does it test what it is supposed to test? (2) Does it test under valid conditions? (3) Is it usable? (4) What effect will it have on teaching? In addition, an empirical verification of performance is often necessary. The first question leads to the basic problem of determining what is meant by ability to write a foreign language.

2.1. *What is writing a foreign language ?* Writing can be thought of as a process going from information to the written forms of a language. If we call the information the *meaning* and the written forms of the language the *form* we can say that writing is a process going from meanings to the written forms in a foreign language. The meanings that may be put into written form are normally very complex. They are even more complex in writing a foreign language, since in addition to individual meanings, technical meanings, cultural meanings and linguistic meanings, there are the meanings characteristic of the native culture which may be difficult to express in the foreign language.

We can describe the process more specifically as organizing logically and effectively information that is accessible to the writer and expressing it in correct written forms and effective style. The written form represents the language, hence it represents sentences, sequences of sentences, modification structures, form classes, functors, contents words, idioms, and morphophonemic alternations, through spelling and punctuation in alphabetic writing, syllable symbols and punctuation in syllabic writing, and morphemic symbols and punctuation in morphemic writing. Effective style refers to the type of writing and to audience contact. Style varies for letters, poetry, the drama, reports, stories, etc. Organization, vocabulary, examples, etc. have to be adapted to the reading audience to be effective.

This description of writing excludes those dimensions of literary creation that would characterize *Hamlet, Don Quijote, The Old Man and the Sea,* etc. These dimensions are hardly to be identified in a test written under pressure and scored by persons who must be assumed not to possess the genius of great literary creativity themselves. Also excluded from testing is the ability to write an original criticism of some great literary work. Even seasoned literary critics could not be expected to create an original contribution in every composition test.

We must also eliminate technical or specialized information that might not be accessible to the writer since a student who wrote a poor paper for lack of information would not have been tested on his ability to write the foreign language. For the same reason we exclude any intelligence factors beyond the normal range of the students we aim to test.

2.2 *Validity of linguistic content.* If we accept at least in general terms this description of what writing a foreign language is, we can then inquire into the validity of the linguistic content of a composition to test this ability. The answer is that a single composition is usually a poor sample of the ability to write a foreign language. Note the following points: (1) Most compositions do not require the use of a single question or request sentence. (2) Students can avoid the use of constructions, etc. that they are hesitant about, which are precisely the ones we would like to test. (3) A single composition is usually a poor sample of the vocabulary of the student. (4) A single composition is a very inadequate sample of the student's ability to organize his thinking, since the topic may not be one which he can handle at his best, or on the contrary he may have read articles on the same subject and may merely be showing that he remembers them well. (5) Any one composition would normally touch on a limited number of spelling and punctuation problems and the student could easily avoid even some of these.

2.3. *Validity of performance.* Since writing a composition is a type of performance test, that is, the student is asked to perform a sample of the very activity we wish to test, the composition test is valid in this respect. This validity is limited to an unknown degree by the necessity of setting topics of general interest for which the average student has the necessary information. Such topics as "discuss an important city," "discuss an important book," "describe a recent trip," "describe an important person," and other likely ones can be practiced in advance and may result in spurious performances by some students.

2.4. *Practical considerations.* Composition tests are easy to set and to administer. Scoring them, on the other hand, is their major drawback from the point of view of practical application. Compositions are slow and inaccurate to score. Is the

examiner to score for style, thought content, originality, me-
chanics? Each composition requires difficult decisions that must
be based on complex judgment. The result is disagreement
among different scorers over the same compositions and discrep-
ancy between one judgment by a scorer and a second judgment
by the same scorer at a later time.

H. Chauncey puts it decisively in a recent article :

"...if the essay examinations are somewhat unreliably written, they
are even less reliably read. The basic problem is that teachers do
not agree with themselves when they read papers, much less with
other readers. In one study, for example, an eighth-grade composi-
tion was graded twice by 28 teachers. Fifteen who gave it passing
marks the first time failed it on the second round, while 11 who
failed it the first time passed it the second. As for different readers'
opinions of the same paper, they have on occasion provided grades
ranging from 50 to 98 on the same paper, as read by 142 teachers."

And later,

"To keep 150 readers grading according to a common standard is
essential but will-nigh impossible. In spite of the fact that they are
a highly selected group of teachers — expert readers brought together
under one roof and given a day's training and practice in grading
sample papers before they start on the examinations, and then
supervised closely by veteran 'table leaders' whose sole function is
to iron out problems of consistency in grading — they still do not
agree enough to permit one to view the resulting grades with
confidence."[1]

2.5. *Effect on teaching.* It is well known that examina-
tions influence teaching practices. If translation is used in the
examinations, teachers and students will emphasize translation
in class. Similarly, if the examination includes a composition,
there will be composition assignments in class. Consequently,
any class having writing skill as one of its goals will be
strengthened by having a composition in the examination.

Even in this matter, one should not be content with ap-
pearances alone. It is probably quite safe to assume that to learn
to write the student must practice writing. But it is not very
efficient merely to have the student write. Writing compositions
cannot take the place of learning the language. Writing without
proper guidance and grading may tend to perpetuate problems.
Writing compositions without regard for proper organization,
sequence, and correctness would actually encourage habits that
a class is intended to overcome.

2.6. *Empirical validation.* In view of the objections to
a single composition as a sample of writing ability, it would be
necessary to establish the validity of a composition test by empi-
rical means if confidence is to be restored. One way in which
we might check empirically the validity of a composition test is
to compare the grades obtained with it with some more depend-

---

[1] Henry Chauncey, "The Plight of the English Teacher", in *The
Atlantic Monthly* 204, 5 (1959): 123.

able measure of the students' writing ability. Since our objection to a single composition was that it did not provide an adequate sample of the students' writing, we can use as a criterion a number of compositions on a variety of subjects and requiring a variety of writing styles and patterns of construction. If we had a number of students write say six compositions on various subjects, including dialogue, reporting, letters, etc. we would be more likely to have a representative sample of their ability to write.

Another objection to composition tests was the inaccuracy and variability of scoring. If we asked, say, six expert judges to grade the six sets of compositions by our sample of students and if we combined the opinions of the six judges we would have more confidence in the grades assigned. Correlating the scores on the single composition test graded by a single reader with the composite grades obtained by the same students on their six compositions graded by six experts we would have a measure of the validity of the single composition.

Such a study of the empirical validity of a single composition test would be of theoretical interest, but from a practical point of view, it seems unnecessary and irrelevant, since the problems of scoring time, and disagreements in grading would remain unsolved.

3. **Objective, short answer techniques to test writing.**

As mentioned above, the objective, short answer techniques are distrusted. This distrust may be partly due to the fact that they were not developed by scholars in the recognized fields of knowledge but by people who worked on testing without specific attachment to any particular field. Ultimately they were started by psychologists interested in measuring intelligence.

As a matter of fact, it is proper that we should not accept objective tests on the basis of appearance — face validity — alone, any more than we can trust white pills as a cure for pneumonia on the basis of their appearance. The validity of objective tests has to be demonstrated by means other than their appearance. We can check the linguistic problems they contain, we can analyze the process involved in answering the items, and we can check their validity empirically. We can also consider their merits from the point of view of administration and scoring.

Do objective techniques test the linguistic and other elements involved in writing? Not unless the items are specifically constructed for that purpose. The common opinion is that the minor details such as spelling, punctuation, and vocabulary are tested by objective tests but that the more abstract matters of organization, sequence, etc. are not. As a matter of fact, an

objective technique does not guarantee that even spelling will be tested unless the items are devised and written to test spelling. On the other hand, if we know what the elements of writing are, objective techniques can be devised and items written to test those elements, even organization, sequence, style, etc.

But can the act of answering an objective item be a valid sample of the students' ability to write connected material? Some of the objective techniques are "essentially" writing techniques, for example, completion items. The student may be asked to fill a blank with a word that properly fits the context. He may have to write the proper punctuation at marked points where crucial problems must be met. He may be asked merely to supply the missing letters in an otherw.se complete sentence, with the added consideration that the missing letters are precisely the ones which the students misspell.

Rearranging scrambled parts of a sentence is essentially equivalent to writing if the elements of the sentence can be presumed to be easily known to the student while the order in the sentence is a production problem. Multiple choice items can also be made equivalent to writing if the distractors are actually the ones that students would write if they did not know with certainty the right response.

Other objective techniques are not in any way equivalent or comparable to writing, for example, a multiple choice item in which the choices give possible meanings of the lead. This would be essentially a comprehension item. The student who gives the right answer may be utterly unable to write the lead correctly from the meaning.

Still others fall somewhere between these, for example, an item that may contain an error to be corrected by the student. This requires identification of the type an editor practices, which may or may not be the same as writing a correct sentence to begin with. The correction part is somewhat like writing though the incorrect form as stimulus may be a stronger suggestion than the student actually faces in writing.

Administrating and scoring. The administration of objective tests is more intricate than that of composition tests. Good objective tests, however, usually have a few examples and instructions to facilitate administration.

Simple and efficient scoring is an outstanding advantage of objective tests. Scores are usually dependable and uniform for all examiners, and marking the papers is as a rule a very fast matter. It is not unusual for any scorer to handle one hundred papers of one hundred problems each in one hour, whereas even a skillful reader can grade only a few short compositions in the same length of time.

Constructing good objective tests is a delicate and slow process. For small numbers of students it may therefore be uneconomical to prepare them, but when any substantial number of students must be tested great saving accrues from their use.

Effect on teaching. It may well be that because objective tests are not generally thought to test writing ability, when they are used exclusively in the examinations, they discourage writing as an exercise in the classes. For this reason, it may generally be wise to keep a short composition in the examinations even though because of the limitations of a composition as a writing test it should not weigh much in the total score.

Empirical validation. Even if the objective technique is essentially the same as writing, the question may still remain as to whether the student who can handle successfully the various elements in writing when presented separately as individual problems can also integrate all the elements effectively in actually writing compositions. To answer this question it is necessary to compare the scores on the test with some dependable measure of each student's ability to write the language. Such a measure, called the criterion, could be obtained as indicated above by having each student write six compositions on a variety of topics and in various styles and to have a panel of six expert judges grade them in order to obtain the average grade of the judges for each student. If the correlation between these composite scores and the objective test scores is sufficiently high we accept the test scores with confidence as representing ability to write the foreign language.

Refinement of the test. Objective techniques have the further advantage that the effectiveness of each item can be studied with the aid of statistical devices so that poor items can be eliminated or rewritten, and equivalent forms of the test can be produced.

4. Some ways in which objective techniques can measure the elements of writing.

There is no reason why even such abstract elements of writing as organization, sequence and style cannot be tested effectively by objective techniques. An item to test organization could be constructive wh ch gave the student the main points to be included as a composit on plus some irrelevant or unrelated ones. The student would simply indicate the order of the elements he would include. This is essent ally the same as writing a composition. If the facts and considerations to be included are not known to the student, he cannot write the composition.

Sequence in the sense of proper order of elements is akin to organization. In the sense of proper transition between ele-

ments it can be tested by items in which the transitions and se-
quence signals have been omitted and the student is asked to
restore them.

Types of sentences and sequences of sentences can be tested
in a variety of ways. Completion items with enough context to
require the use of troublesome parts of various patterns are much
like writing. Similar techniques can be used to test some matters
of style by omitting crucial parts and leaving enough context to
define the type of writing or style required.

Techniques to test punctuation and spelling objectively
may give everything except the crucial punctuation or crucial
letters and ask the student to supply them.

For a full treatment of the rationale and practice in prepar-
ing and using foreign language tests see the forthcoming, *Lan-
guage Testing*, by R. Lado, which will be published by Long-
mans, Green and Co. For a practical discussion of the deter-
mination of the writing problems of students learning to write
a foreign language see *Linguistics Across Cultures* by the same
author, published by the University of Michigan Press, 1957.
The most complete reference book on published tests, test re-
views, and publications on the construction, use, and limitations
of specific tests is the *Fifth Mental Measurements Yearbook* edited
by Oscar K. Buros, published by the Griphon Press of Highland
Park, New Jersey, in 1959.

●

OBSERVATIONS SUR LE COMPORTEMENT DU
SCHWA EN FRANCO-CANADIEN

James E. La Follette, Georgetown University[1]

Les notes que nous avons réunies dans le présent article sur le schwa en franco-canadien, ont été rédigées d'après des textes oraux enregistrés sur ruban magnétique. Ces textes constituent quatre contes de folklore du comté de Charlevoix, et ils représentent approximativement deux heures et demie de débit oral. Les sujets parlants sont des cultivateurs originaires de cette région de la province de Québec qui se situe à quelques 70 milles au nord-est de la ville de Québec, sur la rive nord du fleuve Saint-Laurent. Nous tenons à ajouter que la plupart des faits que nous signalerons ont été notés également dans le parler populaire, et à un moindre degré, dans le parler familier de la ville de Québec.

On sait que l'on désigne par *schwa* la voyelle dénommée "*e* muet", "*e* féminin", ou encore "*e* français" dans les textes d'enseignement. C'est la voyelle qu'on entend dans l'article défini "*le*".

Signalons tout d'abord que le *schwa* en franco-canadien n'accuse pas le même timbre qu'il a en français. En français, le *schwa* est nettement palatal et labial, tandis qu'en franco-canadien il est plus central et moins labialisé. Par là, le *schwa* franco-canadien devient assez voisin du [ɨ] central qu'on retrouve dans certaines prononciations américaines de la première syllabe des mots comme *alone, about*. Au point de vue physiologique et au point de vue acoustique, il importe donc de distinguer entre le *schwa* français et le *schwa* franco-canadien.

En plus de son aspect caduc, un des rôles les plus caractéristiques du *schwa* en franco-canadien est la réduction d'un groupe consonantique. A la fin d'un mot, par exemple, le schwa est souvent restitué dans ce but, comme en français. Cf.: *l' reste* [iʀɛstə] *bin tranquille*; ...*une couple* [kʊplə] *d' jours*.

Il y a souvent prothèse ou épenthèse d'un *schwa*. Ce phénomène n'est pas inconnu d'ailleurs dans l'évolution des langues indo-européennes et se retrouve dans divers parlers régionaux de la France. Le *schwa* sert alors comme une espèce de voyelle d'appui à l'endroit d'une consonne suivante, liquide la plupart du temps qui, elle, est presque toujours suivie immédiatement

d'une consonne par suite de la chute d'un autre *schwa*. C'est devant la liquide de l'article défini masculin singulier (*le*) et devant la liquide du préfixe re– qu'on note le plus souvent la prothèse d'un *schwa*. Nous nous servirons de ces deux morphèmes comme exemples dans notre discussion.

Les conditions les plus usuelles où l'on remarque la prothèse d'un *schwa* sont les suivantes : la chute du *schwa* après la liquide provoque la combinaison *consonne liquide + consonne*. Si ce dernier groupe est précédé d'une voyelle dans le groupe rythmique, la liquide s'appuie sur cette voyelle, comme c'est le cas dans les exemples suivants : *Il se met à regarder* [a ʁɡaʁde] ; *Elle met le bois* [a mɛ lbwɒ]. Mais si le groupe *liquide + consonne* est précédé d'une consonne ou d'une pause, alors la liquide développe un schwa prothétique. Cf. *le nez* [əl ne] ; *le gardien* [əl ɡaʁdjẽ] ; *reculez-vous* [əʁk̥yle vu] ; *sur le lendemain* [suʁ [əllãdmẽ] ; *tout le monde remercient* [tu lmɔ̃:d əʁmaʁsĩ] ; *pour redanser* [puʁ əʁdãse].[2] On constate également que la liquide n'a pas toujours à être suivie immédiatement d'une consonne pour développer un *schwa* d'appui. Dans le mot *rien*, prononcé [əʁijẽ] avec une voyelle [i] après la liquide, et dans *il reste* [jəʁɛst], la liquide est suivie d'une voyelle.

On rencontre un *schwa* épenthétique dans des mots qui renferment la combinaison *fricative* ou *occlusive sonore + liquide*, et là où il n'y a pas eu nécessairement chute préalable d'un autre *schwa*. Cf. *ouvrier* [uvəʁije] ; *voudriez-vous* [vudəʁijevu].

Enfin, il peut aussi se développer un *schwa* prothétique devant une consonne non-liquide. Dans les trois exemples qui suivent, on le remarque devant [z], [ʒ] et [d], ainsi : *ce beau lit* [əz bo li] ; *comme je veux* [kɔm əʒvø] ; *avec de la laine* [avɛk əd la lɛn]. On aura remarqué que le but de ce *schwa* prothétique (ou épenthétique), ainsi que le terme "voyelle d'appui" l'implique, est de faciliter l'articulation. Dans la majorité des cas, il s'agit d'une espèce de réduction de groupe consonantique, réduction non à la manière du français commun (en restituant le *schwa* à l'endroit même de sa chute), mais en introduisant un *schwa* ailleurs qu'à cet endroit. En dernière analyse, c'est la modification d'une des deux ou trois consonnes au point de vue tension, amenée par l'introduction d'un *schwa* prothétique ou épenthétique, qui permet de réaliser une articulation plus aisée. Dans l'énoncé: *reculez-vous*, par exemple, la chute du *schwa* du préfixe re– crée un groupe de deux consonnes à tension croissante [ʁk] ; mais avec le développement d'un *schwa* prothétique, cette combinaison de deux consonnes croissantes se trouve transformée en un groupe composé d'une consonne décroissante [ʁ] et d'une consonne crois-

---

[2] Il est évident que si l'on considère comme unité les groupes syntaxiques des trois derniers exemples, on peut parler alors d'un schwa épenthétique.

sante [k] ; ce qui revient en somme à l'établissement d'une division syllabique entre les deux consonnes. Ce phénomène est courant d'ailleurs dans divers parlers régionaux de France.

Signalons enfin qu'au lieu d'un *schwa* prothétique, on a de temps en temps devant [ʁ] un [a] prothétique. Il est probable que le *schwa* subit dans ce cas l'influence ouvrante du [ʁ] vélaire suivant.   On sait également que le *schwa* se maintient difficilement en position initiale, surtout à l'initiale absolue, par exemple au commencement d'une phrase. En plus de subir l'influence du [ʁ], il est fort possible que le *schwa* prothétique tende alors à s'étoffer et à passer à une voyelle voisine.   C'est ainsi qu'on peut entendre en franco-canadien: *rien* [aʁijē] ; *il ressourd* [jaʁsu] ; *reculez-vous* [aʁḳylevu].

Il ne faudrait pas terminer une discussion qui touche à l'article défini sans parler du cas où le schwa seul se dit pour ce morphème au masculin du singulier (le=[ə]).   Cf. *Il poigne le bouquet* [i pɔɲ ə bukɛ] ; *le chasseur* [ə ʃasœ:ʁ] ; *dans le salon* [dã ə salɔ̄] ; *prends le petit chemin* [pʁã ə pṭi ʃmē].   Deux explications possibles de cette forme de l'article *le* s'offrent selon le contexte phonétique de ce morphème. Dans les deux premiers exemples, où l'article est précédé d'une consonne ou d'une pause, on voit [əl] passer à [ə].   Ici on dirait que le [l] de l'article, après avoir développé un [ə] prothétique, s'assimile intégralement à la consonne croissante suivante.   Dans les deux derniers exemples où l'article est précédé d'une voyelle, c'est [l] qui passe à [ə].   On se demande si l'on peut voir ici une assimilation de la sonnante [l] à la voyelle précédente par vocalisation.   Enfin, la prononciation du type [pʁã· pṭi ʃmē], notée dans les contes étudiés et à Québec, et dans laquelle l'article n'est plus représenté que par un léger rallongement de la voyelle précédente, montrerait une assimilation plus complète du [l] de l'article à la voyelle précédente.

Il y a des cas en franco-canadien où la chute du *schwa* peut provoquer une altération dans la syntaxe de la chrase.   Il s'agit ici du groupe *de là*, constitué par la préposition *de* suivie de l'adverbe *là*.   Il semblerait que, par suite de la chute du *schwa* de la préposition, le [d] de celle-ci se soit agglutiné à l'adverbe si bien que ce [d], ayant subi une espèce d'affaiblissement sémantique, aurait cessé d'être suffisant à dénoncer la préposition. Il est, bien entendu, fort difficile de dégager les causes de cet affaiblissement sémantique, à moins que cela ne tienne, en partie du moins, à la grande fréquence d'emploi du groupe *d' là* [dla].   Toujours est-il que, dans cet état de choses, l'expressivité de la consonne [d] se trouvant atteinte, il a fallu la restituer en réintroduisant la préposition *de*.   Le résultat de cette restitution est le groupe à redoublement *de d'là* [dəd la], très courant dans la langue populaire du Canada français.   Il est à remarquer que le deuxième élément (*d'là*) de ce nouveau groupe semble faire fonction alors du seul adverbe *là*.

Par anticipation, on pourrait supposer une étape subséquente du phénomène, qui serait représentée par l'emploi absolu de la forme *d'là*, c'est-à-dire une étape où la forme agglutinée *d'là* se dirait à la place de l'adverbe *là*, même en dehors du groupe à redoublement *de d'là*. Cette étape pourtant n'est pas attestée pour ce qui est de l'adverbe *là*. Par contre, elle semblerait l'être dans le cas du démonstratif *ça*. C'est dire que le groupe agglutiné *d'ça* [ḑsa] est passé à *de d'ça* [də ḑsa] par réintroduction de la préposition *de;* et la forme agglutinée *d'ça* [ḑsa] fait fonction du seul démonstratif *ça*. Mais le phénomène semble avoir progressé encore plus loin que dans le cas de l'adverbe *là*. C'est ainsi que nous relevons des exemples où la forme agglutinée *d'ça* [ḑsa] semble se substituer à la forme normale *ça* [sa] en dehors du groupe *de d'ça*. On entend alors des phrases comme les suivantes: *C'est lui qui avait organizé ça* [ḑsa]; *Vous avez déjà vu ça* [ḑsa]. Voici, enfin, quelques autres exemples de la forme redoublée de la préposition *de* : *Lui, de là* [də dla], *il a été se réfugier sur un seigneur; Tu vas sortir de ça* [də ḑsa] ; *On parle pas de ça* [də ḑsa]; *V'là de ça* [də ḑsa] *bin longtemps*, etc. Il est curieux de remarquer que ce phénomène de redoublement de la préposition *de* semble s'étendre parfois à d'autres mots, notamment devant des morphèmes grammaticaux. Nous l'avons constaté devant l'article défini féminin singulier, devant l'adjectif possessif féminin singulier, et devant l'adverbe *loin*. Cf. *...au-dessus du cadre de la* [də dla] *porte là; On va entreprendre de la* [də dla] *laine à filer; ...dans la ceinture de sa* [də ḑsa] *robe, là; Elle* [a] *suit Marlin de loin* [də dlwɛ̃]. Une étude poussée de ce phénomène reste à faire et livrerait sans doute des résultats plus définitifs en fait d'explications. On devrait, par exemple, prendre en considération aussi l'influence possible de groupes comme *de dessus* [də ḑsy], *de dessous* [də ḑsu], *de dedans* [də ddã], *de devant* [də dvã].

De toutes façons, il est assez probable que le phénomène du redoublement de la préposition « de » devant certains mots, constitue un legs de l'ancienne langue apporté dans la Nouvelle France par les premiers colons français au XVIIe siècle. Le phénomène existe dans un bon nombre de parlers régionaux de France. Il faudrait se rappeler aussi, par exemple, qu'on retrouve des groupes comme « de devant » et « de dedans » en ancien français, avec la valeur de « devant » et « dedans », respectivement. Cependant la forme redoublée devant l'article « la » et devant l'adjectif possessif « sa » semble plutôt canadienne que française, de même que la forme [ḑsa] (= ça) non précédée de la préposition « de ».

La chute du *schwa* ne dépend pas uniquement de son voisinage phonétique. La rapidité du discours et le degré d'insistance porté sur les mots ont, eux aussi, une influence sur son caractère caduc dans la langue parlée. A l'encontre des exemples que nous avons déjà cités où un *schwa* est restitué ou introduit

pour rendre plus aisée l'articulation, dans ceux qui suivent on constatera la conservation du *schwa* là où il devrait normalement tomber. Nous n'avons que deux exemples à citer, mais tenons à dire que ce genre de conservation du *schwa* devant la voyelle initiale d'un mot sous l'accent a déjà été noté dans le parler populaire ou familier de Québec. Cf. *C'était plus fort que elle* [kə ɛl] ; *On va dire que eux autres* [kə øzot] *ont tout fini.* Il convient de faire remarquer que dans ces derniers exemples n'y a pas de pause entre le conjonctif *que* et le mot suivant à initiale vocalique. L'emploi de ce genre de conservation ne semble pas très répandu et sa fréquence dans le parler franco-canadien retse à établir.

Toujours dans l'ordre de l'accent tonique, signalons en passant l'ancienne forme accentuée de *le*, pronom d'objet direct masculin, 3e personne du singulier. Ce morphème se prononce [le] sous l'accent tonique d'un groupe verbal à l'impératif affirmatif. Aussi entend-on: *Arrachez-moi le* [le] ; *Faites-le* [fɛt le], etc. On relève cette forme également à l'impératif négatif, c'est-à-dire lorsqu'elle ne se trouve point sous l'accent tonique: *Faites-le pas* [fɛt lə pɒ], etc.

Le *schwa*, dans le parler populaire, peut être aussi l'objet de la dilation vocalique. Dans les cas que nous avons relevés, il se prononce alors [a]. Nous parlons ici de l'ancienne forme du démonstratif *cette*, qui se disait souvent au XVIIe siècle [stə] devant consonne, et du pronom relatif accusatif *que*. Sous l'influence de la voyelle accentuée [a] de la syllabe suivante, *que* devient [ka], et ''cette'' [stə] devient [sta]. Cf. *Montre-moué de ce que t'as* [ska ta] ; ...*cette vache* [sta vaʃ]*-là* ; ...*cette femme* [sta fam]*-là*. On a relevé également un exemple où le [a] de la syllabe suivante n'est pas accentué: ...*une île que le chasseur* [ka lʃasœ:ʁ] *avait ravaillée.* Ces formes aussi ont été constatées dans la région de Québec.

Il y a un morphème grammatical où le *schwa* paraît régulièrement en position initiale dans le langage populaire; il s'agit de l'article indéfini féminin *une* qui se prononce [ən] : *une femme* [ən fam], *une maison* [ən mɛzɔ̃]. Dans le discours de tous les jours, le *schwa* subit la chute et il ne reste plus que la sonnante [n], ainsi: [n fam], [n mɛzɔ̃]. M. Locke, du Massachusetts Institute of Technology, dans son étude sur le parler franco-canadien de Brunswick, Maine (E.-U.)[3] considère cette voyelle zéro de l'article indéfini comme un allophone du *schwa*.

D'après les observations que nous venons de faire, il est possible que des études plus poussées dans ce domaine nous amènent à considérer [ə], [e], [a] et *zéro* comme quatre allophones canadiens du schwa.

[3] *Pronunciation of the French spoken at Brunswick, Maine.* American Dialect Society, No 12 (1949).

Il resterait, certes, bien d'autres choses à dire sur le *schwa* en franco-canadien.   Nous espérons toutefois avoir donné une idée — si mince soit-elle — de ce qu'on peut tirer d'un texte oral, enregistré quand le sujet parlant ignore que le but de l'enregistrement est d'analyser son langage.   Nous avons déjà préconisé l'examen attentif de cette source d'informations linguistiques dans une communication présentée au Troisième Congrès de la Langue Française à Québec en 1952. Les textes oraux enregistrés renferment, à notre avis, une véritable mine d'informations sur la langue parlée, et leur analyse compléterait d'une manière très utile les autres enquêtes linguistiques.   Nous ne sommes d'ailleurs pas seul à appuyer l'examen des textes oraux enregistrés. D'autres, dont Mgr Pierre Gardette, Recteur des Facultés Catholiques de Lyon, auteur de l'*Atlas inguistique du Lyonnais*, estiment également que ce genre d'enquête pourrait être très fructueux.   De plus, il conviendrait d'examiner, en dehors du domaine folklorique, d'autres enregistrements en discours libre de sujets qui ignoreraient le but de l'enregistrement et, mieux encore, de sujets qui ignoreraient même qu'on enregistre leurs paroles. A première vue, ceci peut paraître un peu bizarre, mais la chose pourrait se faire et il est très possible que les résultats de ce genre d'enquête nous réservent des surprises.

●

TAGMEMIC ANALYSIS OF A RESTRICTED CREE TEXT

C. Douglas Ellis, University of Toronto

1. The following presentation shows the structural analysis of a Cree[1] text in terms of tagmemic formula. The procedure, developed by K. L. Pike, and described in his *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior*,[2] is based on the hypothesis that linguistic patterning is related to the patterning of all purposeful behavior. Crucial to the theory is the structural concept of *slot*-plus-*class* (of filler), which together comprise the *tagmeme*,[3] i.e., the structurally relevant unit of grammatical arrangement.

At this point, two observations may be helpful. In the first place, there is a distinction between Pike's use of the term *tagmeme* and that of Bloomfield. For Bloomfield, the tagmeme was any meaningful component.[4] For Pike, the tagmeme (née

---

[1] Cree is a member of the Algonquian language family.

The narratives in the text were recorded by Mr. Joel Linklater of Fort Albany, Ontario, on the west coast of James Bay, in July, 1958. Thanks are also due to Mr. Alan Wheatley, Principal, Moose Fort Indian Residential School, for his help, and to Mr. Andrew Faries of Moose Factory, Ontario, for assistance in the transcription and translation of the texts.

The conventions of Cree syllabic spelling have been followed in writing personal prefixes and aspect markers separately: e.g., *mo·na ma·ka n'ki· ohci nipaha·na·n*. Since they really form part of the larger word unit it would be better to write, *mo·na ma·ka n'ki· – ohci – nipaha·na·n*, – and so consistently throughout.

[2] Part I, Preliminary Edition, Summer Institute of Linguistics, Glendale, California, 1954.

The author wishes to express sincerest thanks to Dr. K. L. Pike for many helpful suggestions in the preparation of this paper.

[3] Cf. K. L. Pike, "On Tagmemes, née Grammemes", *IJAL* 24.4 1958: 273-78.

[4] L. Bloomfield, *Language*, N. Y., 1933; p. 166-7. For Bloomfield the tagmeme had "structural meaning", i. e., was a "feature of meaningful arrangement". Cf. C. F. Hockett, *Lg.* 23 1947:321 fn. 4.

gram (m) eme) is only a given unit with *slot-class* correlation.[5] In the second place, the overall usefulness of a tagmemic approach, is well worth stressing. Beyond the fact that any arbitrary division of the construction (as in IC analysis), is precluded, thereby forcing the final statement to show only what is inherent in the data, the differentiated tagmemic formula (slot and filler) indicates both function within the structure, and the *class* of lexical item fulfilling that function. As the *tagmeme* is the unit of internal structure, so the *sentence-type* is the full unit of structure. The basic unit adopted for the description of the tagmeme in this paper is the clause-type. Owing to the limited nature of the corpus many structural types postulated will necessarily be tentative. Nonetheless, within the limits of the material, it is intended to demonstrate the minimum number of structural types required to account for all constructions occurring, and at the same time to show that this number is adequate. Results are, in the nature of the case, provisional. Further evidence would lead to collation of several of the types listed and split others into two or more. Phrases, as such, are very few in this text; and hence the analysis in 4.2.1 appears somewhat meagre. In a larger text further phrase-types would emerge; but it is not intended here to treat Cree syntax as a whole.[6]

The narratives used were recorded from a native speaker at Fort Albany, Ontario, in July 1958. The speech of this area shows the influence of both the "l" Dialect spoken at Moose, immediately to the south, and of the "n" Dialect, spoken to the north. The phonemic transcription is based on Hockett's revision of Bloomfield's transcription of Plains Cree.[7] No attempt has been made to classify morphemes in anything like century numbers. Such a procedure is more properly suited to the description of a total language structure, than to that of a short text. The text of the narratives is provided herewith. Sentences are numbered and dependent clauses lettered for convenient reference where there are more than two.

---

[5] Cf. "Language, etc.", as per fn. 2 above. Of interest also in showing the beginnings of divergence from Bloomfield is K. L. Pike, "Taxemes and Immediate Constituents", *Lg*. 19 1943:65-82.

[6] It is hoped to do this at the earliest opportunity. This paper is, in effect, a sort of first run over the ground, although, in the light of the restricted material, all formulae must be treated as strictly tentative.

[7] Cf. *Sacred Stories of the Sweet Grass Cree*, Nat. Mus. of Canada, Bull. No. 60, Ottawa, 1930; p. 6.

In the present text unmarked vowels are short. Long vowels are marked with a raised dot, with the exception of /e/, which is always long.

2.1.   MOOSE HUNTING ON THE KWETIPAWAHIKAN
            (Principal Clauses are Italicised)

1. a peyakwa· e ki·šika·k   One day,
    b e natawimo·sweya·hk,   as we were moose-hunting
    c peyak ililiw e wi·cewak,   as I was accompanying a cer-
                                        tain person,
    d kešiciwanohk ohci si·pi·hk   from Kešiciwan (Ft. Alba-
                                        ny) on the river
    . (d¹) .. e išinatawimo·sweya·hk   . (d¹) .. as we - were - moose -
                                        hunting-there-
    d¹ kwetipawahikan ka· icika·tek   which is called Kwetipawa-
                                        hikan
    e (eko ma·ka,) e atipimiška·-   (so then,) as we were begin-
        ya·hk   ning to paddle
        kekat n'ki· pehtawa·w mo·s   *I almost heard a moose*
    f no·hcimihk, mh55, m5h5h55†   making the sound, "mh55,
        e itwehka·sot.   m5h5h55", in the forest.

2. *eko ma·ka mo·na pehtawew ana*   *Then, however, that-one*
    ka· ci·mak.   *whom   I - was - canoeing -*
                                        with did not hear him.

3. *n'koškwepisken ma·ka ci·man*   *But I rock the canoe a little*
    apiši·š,   *bit,*
    kihci kisken'tahk   so he may know
    a·šay mo·swa e peci-no·kosin'ci.   (that) now a moose   (is)
                                        coming-into-sight.

4. *eko ma·ka ka· kipihci·ya·hk*   *So then we stopped there.*
    anta.

5. ispi·y ma·ka e peci-mata·pet ana   But when that moose came
    mo·s, *ki· peci-pahkopew.*   out of the bush, *he came*
                                        into the water.

6. *ki· kipihci·w ma·ka anta.*   *And he stopped there.*

7. *eko ma·ka ka· ma·cipa·skiswa-*   *And then we began to shoot*
    kiht, mo·sasiniya pa·skisikanihk *him,* using moose-shot in
    e a·pacihta·ya·hk.   the guns.

8. *keka ma·ka ki· kisiwa·siw,*   *Finally, however, he got an-*
                                        gry,
    a eka· e nipahakiht, -   as we were not killing him, -
    b e miškwakiht,   since we were hitting him,
    c eka· ma·ka ma·ši e pahkišihk.   but as he was not even
                                        falling.

---

† The informant's mimicry of a moose was realistic rather than con-
ventional (as, e. g., *moo, gr-r-r, bow-wow,* &c.). Hence the transcription
is not to be read as phonemic.

9. *eko ka· kišihta·t*
   a *e kihcipahta·t tetawaka·m si·pi·hk,*
   b *e misaskena·k ana·wis*

   c *e a·pitawipenik kekat wiyaw*

Then he finished,
   by running away in mid-stream in the river,
   hardly touching bottom (in its-being-bottom)
   with almost half of his body in the water.

10. *eko ma·ka ka· nawahwakiht, - na·spic k'elikohk e 'miška·ya·hk.*
    keka awasite ki· atina·wina·- kosiw ispi·š e ispi·cipaliya·hk ni·nana·n.

And so we went after him, - paddling as hard as we could.
    Finally he began to draw further away faster than we were travelling.

11. *eko ma·ka keka, mi·na ka· wi·- seskipahta·t no·hcimihk iši.*

And then at last, he was going to run ashore again toward the bush.

12. *eko mi·na ka· kihcihta·ya·hk e pa·sk·swakiht.*

Then again we started in shooting (at) him.

13. *mo·na ma·ka n'ki· ohci nipa- ha·na·n anta mekwa·c e no·- kosit.*

But we did not kill him there while he was in sight.

14. *ispi·y ma·ka e 'tiliskipalit li·pisi·hk,*
    kekat n'ki· išipa·skisika·n e 'tikoškopaliki li·pisiya.

But when he began to disappear in the leaves.
    I shot at nearly about that point as the leaves began to sway.

15. *ekwa·ni ma·ka ka· ohci, - ka· ohci pahkišihk, nipi·hk iši.*

And that (is it) as a result of which, - result of which he fell into the water.

2.2. GETTING FROZEN IN A MOOSE HIDE

1. a *peyakwa· e pipohk,*
   b *ki· -, e ki· itohtet peyak ililiw*
   c *e 'na·tawimo·swet,*
   d *e 'na·tawa·pama·t mo·swa*
   e *ke ohci pima·tisit......*

One winter,
   a certain person had -, having gone
   searching-for-moose,
   looking for a moose
   from which he might live (i.e., "for food")......

2. *eko ka· wa·pama·t mo·swa, animeniw e natawimo·swet.*

Then he saw a moose,
   that time (as he was) moose-hunting.

3. *ki· nipahew ma·ka.*

And he killed him.

4. *a·šay ma·ka wa·law ki· ihta·w*   *But now he was far away*
   ka· iši·hta·t o taši·hkewinihk.   (from) where he was in his
                                    dwelling.

5. *a·šay ma·ka mitoni tipiska·niw.* *And now it is getting very*
                                      dark.

6. *mo·na ma·ka ki· ispaliw*   *It is impossible for him*
   kihci ki·wet.   to go home.

7. *eko ka· itelihtahk*   *So he thought*
   a ispi·y ka· pahkona· t anihi o when he had skinned that
     mo·soma,   moose of his,
   b kihci to·tahk   that he would take measures
                             ("do it")
   c e iši, - eka· 'ci si·hkacit   thus, - not to be cold
   d e tipiska·nik   at night
   e e nipa·t   sleeping
   f e pipohk,   in winter,
   g e tahka·ya·nik ohci.   from the cold.

8. *eko ka·, - ka· itelihtahk,*   *So he, - he thought,*
   kihci wi·skwekoni·t anihi mo·s- that he would wrap up (in)
   waya·na.   that moose-hide.

9. *eko ka· kawešimot*   *So he went to bed*
   e wi·skwekoni·t anihi wa·po·š- wrapping up (in) that rab-
   waya·na, - anihi mo·swaya·na.   bit-skin,* - that moose-
                              hide.

10. *eko ma·ka*   *And so*
   a ispi·y e kišepaya·nik,   when it was morning,
   b ispi·y e wi·waniška·t,   when he wanted to get up,
     mo·na wa·wac ki· ohci kaš- *he could not even manage*
     kihta·w
   c kihci koškot,   to stir,
   d e a·hkwacišin'ci anihi mo·s- as that moose-hide was fro-
   waya·na.   zen.

11. *eko ka· ihta·t ante*   *So there he was*
   eka· e ki· walawi·t anihi mo·s- not able to get out of that
   waya·nihk.   moose-hide.

12. *ma·sko·c ma·ka wayeš nisto-* *And he was there perhaps*
   ki·šika·w ki· ihta·w anta   about three days
   a *pa·tima·-ka· takošihk*
     kotakiy' 'wenihka·na   until somebody else arrived
   b e 'na·tawima·kaniwit   as he was being searched for
   c e wanihiht, -   since he was lost, -
   d eka· e ki· ki·wet.   being unable to go home.

---

* Informant inadvertently said "rabbit" for "moose-hide".

13. *eko ka· peci-kotawa·niwahk* *Then they came (and) a fire*
           was made

 e a·pawiswa·kaniwit ana that moose-hide being thawed
 mo·swaya·n,   out,

 kihci walawi·t ana ililiw anta so that that man might get
 ohci, mo·swaya·nihk.   out from there in the
           moose-hide.

<div align="center">★</div>

The following explanation of symbols used in the formulae
may serve to elucidate some less obvious abbreviations.

Asp	— aspect indicator
A	— animate (Subj. or Obj.)
c	— (after TV, IV) Conjunct Order
C	— complement
Cj	— conjunction
ct	— action-in-process marker in aspect slot (with conjunct only).
fc	— intentive (future) marker with Conjunct.
G	— goal with intrans. verb
I	— inanimate (Subj. or Obj.)
IV	— intransitive verb
L	— location
lp	— locating particle
lx	— locating expression
M	— manner
mp	— manner particle
N	— noun
Nx	— noun expression
nc	— negation marker with Conjunct Order of verb
ni	— negation marker with Independent Order of verb
npi	— completed-action marker with Indep., or with Relative-or-ct plus Conjunct in neg. construction
O, Obj	— object
pi	— completed-action marker with Indep. or with Relative-or-ct plus Conjunct in positive cstr.
PM	— predicate modifier
pot.p	— potential particle
Pred	— predicate
pron	— pronoun
ptcl	— particle
Purp	— purpose
rp	— relative particle
S, Subj	— subject

st	— stem
T	— time
TA	— transitive verb with animate object
TI	— transitive verb with inanimate object
TI2	— as above: second type
tmp	— time particle
TV	— transitive verb
I	— 1st pers. sing.
II	— 1st pers. pl. exclusive
3	— 3rd pers. sing. } Prox. Anim.
33	— 3rd pers. plur. }
3'	— 3rd pers. Obviative Anim. (no number)
0	— 3rd pers. sing. } Prox. Inan.
00	— 3rd pers. plur. }
0'	— 3rd pers. Obviative Inan.
+	— obligatory
#	— optional
/	— "or"
:	— "consisting of"

3.   TABULATION OF CLAUSE-TYPES

Principal Clauses :

> (Correlation of verb-margin with Subj. and/or Obj.
> shown in raised type. $++$ indicates a hyper-class
> (e.g., TV), with subclassification (e.g., TA, TI),
> not shown in formula.)

Clause-type 1.

Meaning and Form : Statement of transitive action by a
1st or 3rd person animate subject upon an object, and expressed
by a verb which stands formally independent of any construc-
tion outside itself.

$\#$**Cj**: eko $\#$**Cj**: ma·ka[†] $\#$**Neg**: ni $\#$**M**: mp $+$ **Subj**:
pron^{1}/$\#3$* $\#$**Asp**: pi/npi **$++$ Pred**: TV$^{\text{Subj.-Obj.}}$* $\#$**S**:
Nx*/*** $\#$**O**: N$^{\text{A/I}}$ $\#$**L**: lx $\#$**M**: mp.

[†]**Cj**: ma·ka always occurs as second member in its clause. The
"verb-complex", i.e., from the personal subject-marker
to the end of the verb-margin, is a unit which cannot be
broken by conjunction or modifier of any of the parts.
Ma·ka, if occurring in the minimum form of the clause-
type would occur after Pred: - cf. 2.1.6; 2.2.3.

*Tr.: Margin suffix shows concord with Subj: pron $^{\text{I,U}}$/$\#^{3,3'}$,
and shows number for Subj: pron $^{\text{I/U}}$/$\#^{3}$. Tr. Margin
(and with certain verbs, Tr Base), shows concord with
gender of Object. TAnimate Margin shows concord

— 41 —

with number of both, except in case of 3', where there
is no distinction for number of either Subject or Object.

** With negative marker, Asp: pi, "ki·'", >"# ki· + ohci".

*** Subject-slot filler other than *pers. pron.* must stand out-
side verb complex (*cf.*† **Cj**: ma·ka, *above*), and in this
corpus occurs only after.

NOTE: All clause-types are stated subject to the overriding re-
strictions that (within the present corpus),

    a) no example of a locating expression (L), may occur
in more than one position within the same clause-
type;

    b) no example of time-indicator (T), whether particle
or expression, may occur after the predicate if one
or more already occurs before in the same clause, and
vice versa.

Clause-type 2.

Meaning and Form : Statement of a state or intransitive
action on the part of a 1st or 3rd person animate subject, or a
3rd person inanimate subject, and expressed by a verb which
stands formally independent of any construction outside itself.
The verb margin never shows any correlation for goal, although
the verb may be goal-oriented. This is critical in causing this
clause-type to be distinguished formally from Clause-type 1.

Probability: prob. p. # **T**: tmp/tx # **Neg**: ni # **M**:
mp # **L**: lp + **Subj**: pron ^{1}/#[3]* # **Asp**: pi/$n$pi**
Potentiality: pot. p ++ **Pred**: IV[S]* # **PM**: lp.

*Intr. Margin suffix shows concord with Subj: pron
^{I,U}/#[3,3'], and shows number for Subj: pron ^{I,U}/#[3].

**as for Transitive.

Clause-type 3.

Meaning and Form: Has the force of an equational state-
ment but the subject is overtly marked while the predicate and
complement are in the text left unstated. The feature which
distinguishes the above from the two foregoing clauses-types is
the characteristic absence of predicate linking subject and object
or complement.

+ **Subj**: pron ^{O} # **Cj**: ma·ka.

Clause-type 4.

Meaning and Form: Statement of transitive action by a 1st
or 3rd person animate subject upon an object, the statement
standing in a loose relation to some preceding discourse, indicated

by the conjunctive particle *eko,* "then," which is followed by the predicate consisting of a verb in the conjunct order.

$+$ **Cj**: eko $\#$ **M**: mp $\#$ **Asp**: pc $++$ **Pred**: TVc Subj.-Obj.
$+$ **O**: N

Clause-type 5.

Meaning and Form: Statement of a state or intransitive action by a 1st or 3rd person animate subject, the statement standing in a loose relation to some preceding discourse, indicated by the conjunctive particle *eko* which is followed by a predicate consisting of a verb in the conjunct order. As in the case of Clause-type 2, the verb margin never shows any correlation for goal. This imposes a formal distinction between Cl.-type 4 and Cl.-type 5.

$+$ **Cj**: eko $\#$ **T**: tmp $\#$ **M**: mp $+$ **Asp**: pc $++$ **Pred**: IVc Subj. $\#$ **L**: lx

Both the above (Cl.-types 4 and 5) must be distinguished from Cl.-types. 1 and 2 in that 4 and 5 shows formally a loose relation with something preceding, whereas 1 and 2 stand independent of any other construction.

Dependent Clauses: Simple:

Clause-type 6.

Meaning and Form: Statement of transitive action by a 1st or 3rd person animate subject upon an object, the total action being subordinate to that of a main verb expressed elsewhere.

$\#$ **O**: N $\#$ **L**: lx $+$ **Asp**: ct $++$ **Pred**: TVc Subj.-Obj.
$\#$ **S**: Nx

Clause-type 7.

Meaning and Form: Statement of a state or intransitive action by a 1st or 3rd person animate subject, or 3rd person inanimate, the total action being dependent upon that of a main verb expressed elsewhere. As in Cl.-types 2 and 5, the verb margin shows no correlation for goal (G), — and this imposes a formal distinction between the above and Cl.-type 6.

$\#$ **Neg**: nc $\#$ **T**: tx (#) $\#$ **M**: mx $\#$ **L**:lx $+$ **Asp**: ct
$\#$ **Asp**: pi/npi $++$ **Pred**: IVc Subj $\#$ **M**: mp **G**: Nx $+$
Subj: Nx $\#$ **L**: lx

Clause-type 7a (Durative Clause).

Meaning and Form: Statement of duration of a state or intransitive action by a (1st or) 3rd person animate subject, with respect to which further action or state is expressed by the predicate in the main clause to which the predicate in the durative clause stands in dependent relation formally.

$-$ 43 $-$

Note the structural resemblance to Cl.-types 11 and 12, below.

+ **Cj**: mekwa·c + **Asp**: ct ++ **Pred**: IVc [Subj.]

. (Dependent Clauses:) Specific :

Clause-type 8. Relative Clause Transitive.

Meaning and Form: Statement of transitive action by a 1st or 3rd person animate subject upon an object, either of which[8] is marked by the relative particle standing in apposition to something in an adjoining clause, to which the relative clause is in dependent relation.

+ **Rel**: ka· ++ **Pred**: TVc [Subj.-Obj.]

Clause-type 9. Relative Clause Intransitive.

Meaning and Form: Statement of intransitive action or state on the part of a 1st or 3rd person animate subject, or 3rd person inanimate [O], which a) is marked by the relative particle in apposition to a referential item in another clause, or b) with the relative particle having reference to a point in space and supplemented by the correlative preverb *iši*.

C: N + **Rel**: ka· ++ **Pred**: IVc [Subj] # **L**: lx.

As in Cl.-types 2, 5 and 7, the structure demands a distinction between transitive and intransitive clause-types.

Clause-type 10. Result (Causal) Clause Intransitive.

Meaning and Form: Statement of result or causality (indicated by resultative particle), arising from the state or action expressed by the verb filling the predicate slot.

+ **Asp**: ct ++ **Pred**: IVc [Subj] + **Result**: ohci

Clause-type 11. Temporal Clause Transitive.

Meaning and Form: A "when"-clause showing transitive action by a 3rd person animate subject and marking a point in time in relation to the action or state shown by the verb in the principal clause.

+ **Cj**: ispi·y + **Asp**: pc ++ **Pred**: TVc [Subj.-Obj.]
# **O**: Nx

Clause-type 12. Temporal Clause Intransitive.

Meaning and Form: A "when"-clause showing intransitive action by a 3rd person subject, animate or inanimate, and marking a point in time in relation to the action or state shown by the verb in the principal clause.

+ **Cj**: ispi·y + **Asp**: ct ++ **Pred**: IVc [Subj] # **L**: lx
# **S**: Nx

---

[8] A permissible, tentative hypothesis on the analogy of 2.1.1.d', q.v.

As in Cl.-types 2, 5, 7 and 9, the intransitive verb margin shows correlation for subject only and not for goal. Since the transitive verb margin shows correlation for subject and object, this formal distinction must be reflected in classification of structural types.

Clause-type 13. Terminal Clause Intransitive.

Meaning and Form: An "until"-clause, indicating deferred action as expressed by the verb in the principal clause until some stage in the action or state expressed by the verb in the dependent clause.

$+$ **Cj**: pa·tima· $+$ **Asp**: pc $++$ **Pred**: IVc $^{Subj~(3)*}$
\# **S**: Nx$^{(3')*}$

* (Expected concord between IV Margin and person of Subject - 3', Obviative, is not maintained in the example cited, probably due to forgetfulness on the part of the speaker.)

Clause-type 14. Purpose Clause Transitive.

Meaning and Form: Expression of purpose on the part of a 3rd person animate subject (no other person is here attested) to carry out a transitive action on an object, animate or inanimate.[9]

(\# **Neg**: nc) $+$ **Purp**: kihci $++$ **Pred**: TVc $^{Subj.-Obj.}$
\# **O**: Dep. Cl.

Clause-type 15. Purpose Clause Intransitive.

Meaning and Form: Expression of purpose on the part of a 3rd person animate subject (— no example of an inanimate subject being attested in the corpus), to carry out an intransitive action (or, presumably, manifest a state). Internal structure requires a distinction from Cl.-type 14. Cf. Cl.-types 2, 5, 7, 9, 12.

\# **Neg**: nc $+$ **Purp**: kihci $++$ **Pred**: IVc ^{Subj} \# **G**: Nx*
S: Nx \# **L**: lx

* fc — "ke": here a portmanteau for "ka·" (Del. particle) and "ke" (future, or intentive aspect marker with the Conjunct).

* IV Margin shows no concord for Goal-expression; but if Subject is 3rd person, then G takes obviative form.

Clause-type 16. Relative Result Clause Intransitive.

Meaning and Form: Statement of result which attributes the action or state expressed by the clause predicate, with a 3rd person animate subject, to the antecedent of the relative particle.

$+$ **Rel**: ka· $+$ **Result**: ohci $++$ **Pred**: IVc ^{Subj} \# **L**: lx

---

[9] A safe assumption on the basis of other TA — TI parallels, although only an inanimate object is attested.

Clause-type 16a. Relative Result Clause Intransitive.

Meaning and Form: Same basic meaning as above, but cf. discussion in 4.16.a for distinction between the two.

　　+ **Rel. & Asp***: fc + **Result**: ohci ++ **Pred**: IVc ˢᵘᵇʲ·

4.　Clauses centred about the nucleus of a TV form a clause-type (Cf. p. 41, above), of which TV-Independent Order clauses and TV-Conjunct centred clauses may be classed as clause-types at a lower level. The text material, furthermore, warrants distinction of TV into a hyperclass to include TA (Transitive Animate) Verbs, showing concord for person and number of subject, gender and number-or-obviation of object, and TI (Transitive Inanimate) Verbs, showing concord for person and, except where Obviative, number or subject, and gender of object. (A sub-grouping of TI "a·"- stems, often described as "pseudo-transitive inanimate",[10] is here denoted for convenience simply as TI2.) IV similarly composes a hyperclass containing AI (Animate Intransitive) Verbs, showing concord as to person and, except where Obviative, number of the animate subject, and II (Inanimate Intransitive) Verbs, showing concord with the person and number of the inanimate subject (Cf. 4.2.2).

4.1　Clause-type 1 in its minimum form consists of two obligatory units (shown by +, ++), the first of which is simple, the second of which is complex. The first of these is a bound, subject-marking pronoun indicating 1st person, or zero[11] indicating 3 or 3' as subject. The second unit is a transitive verb in the independent order, consisting of a transitive base (often indicating the kind of action, as by hand, instrument, etc., and sometimes showing correlation with the gender of the object), and margin indicating concord with the subject as to person and number, and the object or substitutive object where the object is not specifically designated. (Cf. 4, above).

The following illustrates the minimum form of Clause-type 1 :

　　n'koškwepisken, I rock-it (by body movement) (2.1.3) : (<*n'* <*ni,* 1st person subject; *koškwepi-* rock, roll;

---

[10] Cf. L. Bloomfield, "Algonquian", *LSNA*, p. 112, ff.

[11] Description in terms of zero (#), is preferred for three reasons :

1) Zero may be regarded as a convenient allomorph for a 3rd person, pronominal indicator, {o —, w-} (Cf. o- *mo·soma* — his moose; **w**_iyaw_ — his body.), inasmuch as the 1st and 2nd person possessor prefixes are the same in shape as the subject-marking prefixes.

2) In the Plains Dialect, {o} is known to occur also as a subject prefix with certain preterite forms.

3) The use of the zero allomorph for a 3rd person subject indicator makes for a more symmetrical description.

-sk-, body motion; -en, correlation for 1st (or 2nd) person sg. subject and inanimate object.) *koškwepisken* is a transitive form in the independent order (i.e., in a principal clause), consisting of the transitive base *koškwepisk-*, and the margin -en.

The fullest possible theoretical expansion allowed by the evidence in the text is illustrated by the formula. Since, however, the formula is an "order" diagram rather than one of "occurrence",[12] the empirical situation is governed by the two overriding restrictions stated in NOTE to Clause-type 1. An example of one typical expansion is here given :

mo·na ma·ka n'ki· ohci nipaha·na'n anta, but we did not kill him there (2.1.13) : (<*mo·na*, negative particle; *ma·ka*, but, however; *n'*, 1st person subject; *ki·*, completed action marker obligatory in positive, optional in negative construction; *ohci*, obligatory component of completed action marking expression in negative construction; *nipa-*, kill; -h-, by an instrument; -a·na'n, correlation for II subject, 3 object; *anta*, there.)

Other possible expansions are illustrated by 2.1.1, 2.2.3.

4.2 Clause-type 2 in its minimum form is composed of two obligatory units, the second of which is complex. The first of these, as for Clause-type 1, is the bound, pronominal subject-marker for 1st person, or the zero allomorph for the prefixed 3rd person indicator. The second unit consists of an intransitive verb in the independent order, showing an intransitive base and an Intransitive margin indicating concord with the subject. (Cf. 4.0).

The minimum form may be illustrated by,

kipihci·w, he stops (2.1.6) : (<#, 3S; *kipihc-*, stop; -i-, intr. stem; -w, margin showing concord for 3S.)
kipihci·w is an AI Verb form of which *kipihci·*- forms the base, and -w the margin. The intransitive stem is here represented by the thematic vowel only. In such cases only the base will be given hereafter.

---

[12] The use of +, #, is properly restricted to an "occurrence" diagramme which, as the name suggests, is concerned primarily with the occurrence or non-occurrence empirically of items in any given tagmemic formula. The "order" diagram makes no commitment as to whether any given collation of items may or may not occur in an actualized formula, but is concerned rather with showing the sequence required, if they should occur. Hence commas are more appropriate between tagmemes than the +, #, in a strictly "order" diagram. Throughout this paper (except where otherwise specified), +, #, should be read only in the light of restrictions imposed by actual, textual manifestations of any formulae. Cf. NOTE to Clause-type 1.

One possible expansion of the formula is seen in 2.2.12:

maˑskoˑc maˑka wayeš nistokiˑšikaˑw kiˑ ihtaˑw anta, and he was there perhaps about three days: (<*maˑskoˑc,* perhaps; *maˑka,* and, but; *wayeš,* approximately; *nisto-,* three; *kiˑšikaˑw,* day; *kiˑ,* completed action indicator with independent order; *ihtaˑ-* be (at) :- intr. base; -*w,* 3S; *anta,* there.)

nistokiˑšikaˑw is a composite unit consisting of initial stem *nisto-,* three, and noun-stem *kiˑšikaˑw* ,day, with the total meaning of a "three day period". (With such compound terms of measurement in Cree, the noun indicating unit of measurement is ordinarily left in the singular.)

4.2.1. At the phrase level the following brief formulary statement may be made to cover both Clause-types 1 and 2. These may be further expanded in the corresponding statement following 4.16.a.)

$LocX = +$ **Demonstrative**: dem. pr. $+$ **Dem.Mod**: Rel. Cl. (**Ob**.rp $+$ **Pc**:TV$^{\text{S-Ob}}$)

$Tx = +$ **M**:mp $+$ **N**:NComposite (**NPrebase**:num.st. $+$ **NBase**:Nst)

4.2.2. At the word-level the break-down may be further expressed :

$Noun = +$ **NBase**:Nst
$+$ **NBase**:Nst $+$ **loc. suff**. ⊰-ihk⊱
$+$ **NComposite**: NHperbase ($+$ **NPrebase**: init. st. $+$ **NBase**: Nst)

$TV = +$ **TBase**: TA St ($+$ **TCore**: TRoot $+$ **TVst**: TAst)[a) $+$ **TMargin**: TAsuff [S.g.p.n.-Ob.g.n. b)]
/:TI St($+$**TCore**: TRoot $+$ **TVst**: TIst)[a)] $+$ **TMargin**: TIsuff [S.g.p.n.-Ob.g. b)]

$IV = \#$ **Intr. Prebase**: Init.st $+$ **Intr. Base**: $- - -$
$- - -$ AI St($+$**IntrCore**: IRoot $+$ **IntrSt**: AIst)[c)] $+$ **IntrMargin**: AIsuff [S.g.p.n.]
$- - -$ II St ($+$**IntrCore**: IRoot $+$ **IntrSt**: IISt) $+$ **IntrMargin**: IIsuff [S.g.p.n.]

In view of the provisional nature of the above formulae, $+$ should be read in 4.2.1, and 4.2.2, as "occurs".

4.3. The single example of Clause type 3 afforded (2.1.15), is composed of two units, the first of which is complex and the second of which, simple in form. The first of these is the intensive demonstrative for [O]S, and is presumably obligatory. The second is the conjunction, *maˑka,* which, on the analogy of other

clause-types, is most likely optional. Under the circumstances, the minimum form would read,

ekwa·ni,[13] that (one) (is it): (⟨*ekwani* [⟨*ewako*, intensive; *ani*, that one (alternate inan.)], that (is the) very one.)

The addition of *ma·ka*, conjunction, would constitute the only expansion attested: *ekwa·ni ma·ka*, and that (is it)...

a) TVst sometimes, but not always, shows correlation with gender of Object.

b) TA Margin shows concord for gender and *number* of Object; TI Margin for gender only, of Object.

c) Often represented by thematic-or stem-vowel only.

4.4.0   The following two clauses-types are principal clauses, but contain as their predicate a verb in the conjunct order, introduced by the conjunctive particle *eko*, which marks a continuity with the preceding discourse.

4.4.   The minimum form of Clause-type 4 consists of three obligatory units, the first two of which are simple, and the third, complex.   The first of these is the conjunction, *eko*, "then", which introduces the main clause.   The second is the aspect marker indicating completed (and so, past) action. (The corpus gives no example of any other with *eko*.)   The third unit is a transitive verb in the conjunct order.   (Only the indicative mood of the conjunct order is attested in the corpus.)   The verb shows an optional prebase qualifying the verbal base, followed by the transitive core plus transitive stem which often shows correlation with the gender of the object, as well as indicating the type of action (e.g., by hand, instrument, mouth, etc.)   The core plus stem form the transitive base, and are joined to the transitive margin which indicates concord for person and number of the subject (all TA and TI subjects are assumed to be and treated as animate).   In the case of TA Verbs, the margin shows concord for gender and number of the object, and in that of TI, for gender of the object.

The conjunct order takes no prefixed, bound subject marker. The following illustrates the minimum form of Clause-type 4:

eko ka· nawahwakiht, so we went after him: (⟨*eko*, so, then; *ka·*, completed action marker w. conjunct; *nawa-*, pursue; *-hw-*, TA verb-stem often indicating action by instrument; *-akiht*, II S, 30b.)

nawahwakiht is a transitive verb in the conjunct order consisting of the TA Base, *nawahw-* and the margin *-akiht*.

---

[13] This is, in fact, one of the commonest expressions in colloquial Cree: — *ekwa·ni*, "that's all", or "that's it".

One expansion is illustrated by 2.2.2 :

eko ka· wa·pama·t mo·swa, then he saw a moose: (<eko, then; *ka·*, completed action marker w. conjunct; *wa·pa*-see; *-m-*, TA stem indicating action from area of face or eyes; *-a·t*, 3S, 3'Ob,; *mo·s(w)-*, moose; *-a-*, 3' (Ob).)

Another possible expansion is illustrated by 2.1.7 :

eko ma·ka ka· ma·cipa·skiswakiht, and then we began to shoot him : (<eko, then; *ma·ka*, and; *ka·*, completed action marker with conjunct; *ma·ci—*, preverb indicating immediate beginning of an action; *pa·ski-*, shoot; *-sw-*, T|A| verb-stem, action by heat; *-akiht*, IIS, 3 Ob.)

In the first expansion of the above, *wa·pama·t* is a TA verb-form of which *wa·pam-* is the base and *-a·t* the margin. In the second, *ma·ci-* forms the prebase, *pa·skisw-* the base, and *-akiht* the margin.

4.5. As already stated (Cf. p. 43 above), Clause-type 5 has the meaning of intransitive action by a 1st or 3rd person subject animate. (Neither U, i.e., 2nd pers. sg., nor O subjects are attested in the corpus for this clause-type although O may certainly be assumed on the analogy of other clause-types in the material. Cf. 2.1.1.a., 2.2.1.a., etc.,) The minimum form, (p. 43), is composed of three obligatory units, the first two of which are simple, and the third, complex. The first of these is the conjunction, *eko*, then, which introduces the main clause. The second is the aspect marker indicating completed, and so past, action. The third unit is an intransitive verb in the conjunct indicative composed of an optional prebase followed by an intransitive core plus stem, which together form the intransitive base. To this is added the intransitive margin, consisting of the suffix characteristic of the conjunct order and showing concord with the subject whether it is otherwise expressed or not. The minimum form is illustrated by 2.2.9 :

eko ka· kawešimot, so he went to bed: (<eko, so, then; *ka·*, completed action marker; *hawešimo-*, AIst:- go to bed, go to sleep; *-t*, 3S, conj't. indic.)

A possible expansion is illustrated in 2.1.11 :

eko ma·ka keka, mi·na ka· wi·-seskipahta·t no·hcimihk iši : and so at last, he again was going to run ashore toward the bush : (<eko, so, then; *ma·ka*, and; *keka*, at last; *mi·na*, again; *ka·*, completed action marker with conjunct; *wi·-*, preverb, want to; *seski-*, init.st., ashore; *-pahta·-*, non-init. AI st, run; *-t*, 3S, conj. ind; *no·hcimihk*, to the bush; *iši*, thither, toward.)

seskipahta·t is an AI verb-form of which the initial stem *seski-*, non-initial, *-paht-*, plus thematic vowel, *-a·-*, form the

intransitive base.   *-t* forms the intransitive margin.   *wi·-* is a prebase consisting of a preverb.

4.6.0.   A characteristic of dependent clauses in Cree is that the predicate nowhere consists of a verb in the independent order. The present material illustrates, in such cases, the use of the conjunct order only.   Dependent clauses have been grouped into two general types: **Simple**, introduced by the process particle, *e*, optionally preceded by the negative marker, *eka·*, and marking a non-finite aspect of the verb; and **specific** clauses, introduced by a conjunction, and with or without an aspect indicator, depending upon the conjunction.

    Simple clauses are roughly equivalent to a participial modifier in apposition to a verb or noun in English : e.g., n'ki· pehtawa·w mo·s *e itwehka·sot* - I heard a moose *"making the sound"*, or *e nipa·t* - (in his) sleeping. At other times the simple clause functions more as a gerund:- *e tahka·ya·nik ohci* - from the cold, i.e., "from its being cold".   A third frequent usage is for the reporting of indirect speech (Cf. 2.1.3.) :- *a·šay mo·swa e pecino·ko- sin'ci* - that now a moose was coming into sight.

    Specific, has been used to designate clauses of a more restricted type such as relative, relative-result, purpose, temporal, etc. e.g.,   *ka· ci·mak* - whom I-canoe-with:

    ke ohci pima·tisit - from which he-might-live:
    kihci to·tahk - that he-may-do-it:
    ispi·y ka· pahkona·t - when he had skinned-him.

    In the material under consideration, all dependent clauses have the predicate in the conjunct order.

4.6.   The minimum form Clause-type 6 consists of two obligatory units (cf. p. 43), the first of which is simple, the second complex. The first of these is the aspect marker indicating action or state in process at the time of action indicated by the main verb, — or simply a gnomic aspect.   The second is a TV in the conjunct order, having a transitive base composed of transitive core plus stem, which often indicates kind of action (hand, instrument, etc.), and sometimes shows correlation with the gender of the object, — and a transitive margin showing concord with subject and object whether they are specifically indicated or not, and regardless of which clause they are in. The following illustrates the minimum form of Clause-type 6: (2.1.8):

e nipahakiht, in (our:II) killing him: (<*e*, process particle: *nipa*-, kill: *-h-*, TAst., (causative) : *-akiht*, II S, 3 Ob.)

    An expansion would be, 2.2.1 :

e 'na·tawa·pama·t mo·swa, (in his) looking for a moose: (<*e*, process particle: *'na·taw-‹nana·taw-*, preverb meaning search after;

-a·pa- tr. core, see; *-m-*, TA. st., action from area of face: *-a·t*, 3S, 3'Ob; *mo·s*(w), moose; *-a*, 3'.)

'*na·tawa·pama·t* is a TA verb-form in the conjunct indicative, of which '*na·ta*, a preverb comprises the prebase, *wa·pam* the TA base, and *-a·t* the TA margin.

4.7 Clause-type 7 in its minimum form consists of two obligatory units, the first of which is simple, the second complex. The first of these is the aspect marker indicating action or state in process at the time of the action indicated by the main verb, — or simply a gnomic aspect. The second is an IV in the conjunct order, consisting of an intransitive base, composed of intransitive core and stem, and an intransitive margin which shows concord with the subject whether the latter is overtly expressed or not. The following illustrates the minimum form of Clause-type 7 (2.2.7.e & f.) :

> *e nipa·t*, in (his) sleeping: (<*e*, process particle: *nipa·-*, sleep; *-t*, 3S conj't. ind.)

> *e pipohk*, in (its) being winter: (<*e*, process particle; *pipo-*, winter; *-hk*, ⁰ S, conj't. ind.)

One expansion is represented by the following (2.2.1) :

e ki· itohtet peyak ililiw, a certain ("one") person having gone : (<*e*, process particle; *ki·*, completed action marker w. indep. order or *e* plus conjunct; - indicates state or action of verb in dependent clause relative to that of main verb; *it-*, initial stem, thus, thither; *-ohte-*, walk; *-t*, 3S conjunct; *peyak*, one; *ililiw*, person.)

In the above three instances, *nipa·-*, *pipo-* and *itohte-*, form the intransitive bases. *-t*, *-hk*, and *-t* respectively are the margins.

4.7.1. Clause-type 7a should perhaps be regarded as an expansion of the foregoing. The present grouping is, however, necessarily tentative in view of the limited evidence. The single example has accordingly been sub-classified and is illustrated by the following (2.1.13.) :

mekwa·c e no·kosit, during (his) appearing: (< *mekwa·c*, while, during; *e*, process particle; *no·ko-*, appear; *-si-*, AI stem; *-t*, 3 S conjunct.)

no·kosi- comprises the AI base; *-t*, the margin showing 3 S conjunct.

4.8. Clause-type 8 in its minimum form consists of two obligatory units (cf. p. 10), of which the first is simple, the second complex. The first of these is the relative particle indicating the

antecedent (or postcedent), which forms either the subject or object of the TV. The second is a TV in the conjunct order, consisting of a transitive base made up of transitive core plus stem, which latter often indicates the kind of action (by hand, instrument, etc.), and sometimes shows correlation with the gender of the object, — and a transitive margin showing concord with subject and object, whether these be overtly expressed, not expressed overtly, or represented by the relative. The single example attested is illustrated in the following (2.1.2) :

ka· ci·mak, whom I-canoe-(with): (<*ka·*, relative particle, whom, 3 Ob; *ci·m-*, TAst., canoe (with) ; *-ak*, I S, 3 Ob., conjunct.) *ci·m-*, cannot be further reduced.

4.9   The only two examples of Clause-type 9 shown are illustrated below (2.1.1.d'; 2.2.4) :

a) *ka· icika·tek*, which is called: (<*ka*, rp, subj. of clause, referring back to antecedent, *si·pi·y*, in preceding clause; *ic-* <*it-* say so (to) ; *-ika·te-*, passive suffix; *-k*, o S, conjunct order.)

icika·tek shows the formal characteristics of a regular II Verb of which *icika·te-* forms the base and *-k*, the margin.

b) *ka· iši-ihta·t o taši·hkewinihk*, where he was in his dwelling: (< *ka·*, rp referring to point in space; *iši-*, there, supplementing *ka·*; *ihta·-*, be (at) ; *-t*, 3 S, conjunct; o, 3rd person possessor prefix; *taši·hke-*, intr. base, dwell; *-win*, verb-nominalizing final stem; *-ihk*, locative suffix.)

taši·hkewin is a complex noun formation meaning, "dwelling". The 3rd person possessor prefix plus locative suffix yield, o *taši·hkewinihk*, - in (at) his dwelling.

4.10   The only form of Clause-type 10 attested consists of three units, the first and third of which are simple, the second, complex. The first is the action-in-process particle filling the role of aspect marker (as in Clause-type 7). The second is an IV in the conjunct order, consisting of an intransitive base plus margin showing concord with an $^{O'}$ S. The third is the resultative particle postpositive, *ohci*. It is illustrated as follows:

e tahka·ya·nik ohci, from (as-a-result-of) its being cold: (<*e*, process particle; *tahk-*, IV core, cold; *-a·ya·-*, Inan. Intr. st; *-ni-*, obviative suffix; *-k*, ^{O} or $^{O'}$ S, conjunct order; *ohci*, from, because of.)

tahka·ya·nik is an Inanimate Intransitive Verb-form (II), of which *tahka·ya·-* is the base and *-nik* the margin.

This whole clause-type may ultimately have to be considered as a possible expansion of Clause-type 7 since it is expressed by a simple, dependent clause (in this case intransitive), followed by the resultative particle, "ohci" (2.2.7.g). Notwithstanding,

until further evidence is adduced to show where optional tag-
memic items might fit into an expansion, the parallels to Clause-
type 7 may be noted, but it is wiser to list the two as separate
clause-types in conformity with procedure and restrictions stated
at the outset.

4.11   Clause-type 11 introduces the "when"-clause in Cree.
The obligatory units are three, the first two simple, the third
complex.   The first is the conjunction marking a point in time,
ispi·y, "when"; the second, the aspect marker, and the third a
transitive verb in the conjunct order showing a transitive base
plus transitive margin indicating concord for both subject and
object, whether these latter are overtly expressed or not.   The
minimum form may be demonstrated by :

2.1.7.a: *ispi·y ka· pahkona·t*, when he had skinned him: (<*ispi·y*,
when; *ka·*, aspect marker of completed action w. conjunct;
pahk (*w*) -, tr. core, skin, flay; *-n-*, by hand; *-a·t*, 3 S, 3 Ob., con-
junct order.)

pahkona·t is a TA Verb-form in the conjunct order, of which
pahkon- is the base and *-a·t* the margin.   *pahk* (w) shows a
terminal /-w-/ which, when followed by a consonant shows the
regular morphophonemic change to /-o-/. Stems show final
/-w-/ following a consonant, in composition only.

The minimum form may be expanded to the example in
the text:

ispi·y ka· pahkona·t anihi o mo·soma, when he had skinned that
moose of his: (< . . . *anihi*, that one, 3'; *o*, 3rd person possessor
prefix;*mo·s*(*w*), moose (cf. *pahkona·t*, 1.13 above.) ; *-m-*, pos-
sessive stem; *-a*, 3' (Ob)).

4.12   Clause-type 12 in its minimal form consists of three
obligatory units, the first two of which are simple, the third com-
plex. The first is the conjunction marking a point in time,
ispi·y, when; the second, the aspect marker, and the third, an
intransitive verb in the conjunct order showing the usual intran-
sitive base plus margin indicating concord for subject. The mini-
mum form may be illustrated as follows (2.1.5.) :

ispi·y e pecimata·pet, when he came from inland; (< *ispi·y*, when;
e, process particle; *peci-*, prebase consisting of a preverb with
meaning, towards speaker; *mata·pe-*, come-from-inland; *-t*, 3 S,
conjunct.)

pecimata·pet is an AI verb-form in the conjunct indicative, of
which *peci-* is the prebase, *mata·pe-* the base and *-t* the margin.

A possible expansion is represented by the full form of the
same clause :

ispi·y ma·ka e pecimata·pet ana ma·s, but when that moose came

from inland ("out of the bush") : ($\langle$ . . . *maʿka*, but: . . . *ana*, that one, 3' S; *moʿs*, moose. (cf. p. 24, 1.16)).

4.13   The sole example of Clause-type 13 attested in the corpus consists minimally of three obligatory units of which the first two are simple, the third complex. The first is the conjunction marking the temporal terminus, "until"; the second, the aspect marker, and the third, an intransitive verb in the conjunct order showing the usual intransitive base plus margin indicating concord for subject. It may be illustrated by 2.2.12.a :

paʿtimaʿ kaʿ takošihk, until he had arrived: ($\langle$ *paʿtimaʿ*, until: *kaʿ*, completed action (aspect) marker w. conjunct; *takoši-*, arrive:- AI base with *-ni*-stem verbs; *-hk*, 3 S, conj't. indic.)

The full form of the clause quoted illustrates an expansion consisting of the foregoing, plus an expressed subject in the form of a noun-expression, *kotakiy' 'wenihkaʿna*.

paʿtimaʿ kaʿ takošihk kotakiy' 'wenihkaʿna, until somebody else arrived : ($\langle$ . . . *kotak*, other; *-iʿy*(a), 3' suff; *'wenihkaʿn*, somebody; *-a*, 3' suff.)

takošihk is a *-ni-* stem AI verb-form in the conjunct indicative, of which *takoši-* forms the base, and *-hk* the margin showing concord for 3 S. One would have expected concord for a 3' subject, *kotakiy' 'wenihk·na*, i.e., *takošininici*. The lack of concord is probably due to a lapse on the part of the speaker. Nontheless, from the fact that the *takošihk* shows concord for a singular subject, one may deduce that the narrator had a 3' S in mind, even though the obviative does not formally indicate number in ·the animate gender.

4.14   Clause-type 14 in its minimum form consists of two obligatory units of which the first is simple, the second, complex. The first of these is the purpose particle introducing the clause, the second, a transitive verb in the conjunct order consisting of a transitive base, consisting in turn of transitive core plus stem (which latter often shows correlation with the gender of the object as well as indicating the kind of action, as by hand, instrument, etc.,), and a transitive margin showing concord with both subject and object, whether these are overtly expressed or otherwise. The minimal form may be ilustrated by the following (2.2.7.b) :

kihci toʿtahk, so-that he-do-it: ($\langle$*kihci*, purpose particle: *toʿt-*, TI base, do; *-ahk*, 3 S, O' Ob.)

A possible expansion is illustrated in the text (2.1.3) :

kihci kisken'tahk aʿšay maʿswa e pecinoʿkosin'ci, so he might know (it) (that) now a moose was coming into sight: ($\langle$*kihci*. purpose particle; *kisk-*, apperceive: *-en'* $\langle$*-eni-*, mental activity·

-ht-, action from area of face, eyes, showing correlation with inanimate object; *-ahk,* 3 S, O'Ob. The expressed object is the situation represented by the appositional, simple clause: - - -*a·šay,* now, already; *mo·s(w),* moose (cf. 4.11) ; *-a,* 3' (Ob) ; *e,* process particle; *peci-,* towards speaker:- prebase; *no·k(w)-,* appear (cf. 4.11) ; *-si-,* AIst; *-n' ‹-ni-,* obviative stem; *-ci,* 3'S. conjunct indicative.)

kisken'tahk ‹ kiskenihtahk is a TI verb-form in the conjunct indicative, of which *kiskeniht-* is the TI base, and *-ahk,* the margin. *pecino·kosin'ci ‹ pesino·kosinici* is an AI verb-form in the conjunct indicative, of which *peci-,* the prebase, and *no·kosi-,* the normal base, form the total AI base, and *-nici* forms the margin.

4.15. Clause-type 15 in its minimum form consists of two obligatory units of which the first is simple, the second complex. The first of these is the purpose particle introducing the clause, the second, an intransitive verb in the conjunct order consisting of an intransitive base, plus margin showing concord with the subject, whether the latter be overtly expressed or not.

The minimal form is demonstrated by the following (2.2.13) :

kihci walawi·t, so that he go out: (‹ *kihci,* so that; *walawi·-,* go out; *-t,* 3 S, conj't. indic.)

walawi·t is an intransitive verb-form in the conjunct indicative, of which *walawi·-* is the intransitive base, and *-t* the margin.

A typical expansion is illustrated by the full clause (2.2.13):

kihci walawi·t ana ililiw anta ohci mo·swaya·nihk, so that that man might get out from there in the moose-hide: (‹ . . . *ana,* that one, 3 S; *ililiw,* person; *anta,* there; *ohci,* from; *mo·s,* moose; *waya·n,* hide, skin; *-ihk,* locative suffix.)

4.16 Clause-type 16 consists of three obligatory units, the first two simple and the third, complex. The first is the relative particle, referring to an antecedent outside its clause; the second the resultative particle (postpositive) ; and the third, an intransitive verb in the conjunct order, consisting of an intransitive base, plus margin showing concord with the subject, whether the latter be overtly expressed or not.

The minimal form is illustrated as follows (2.1.15):

ka· ohci pahkišihk, as a result of which he fell: (‹ *ka·,* relative particle:- perhaps here fusion of *ka·,* relative plus *ka·,* completed action marker; *ohci,* from as a result of; *pahikši-* fall; *-hk,* 3 S with -ni stem intransitives. (cf. *takošihk,* 5.13).

An expansion is -

ka· ohci p'ahkišihk nipi·hk iši, as a result of which he fell into the water : (< . . . *nipi·-* water; *-hk*, locative suffix; *iši*, thither, there, postpositive.)

Further textual material may well indicate that Cl.-type 16 should be treate drather as an expansion of Cl.-type 9; and the structure of 10 suggests that the subject of Cl.-type 16 might also be inanimate. Provisionally, however, 16 has been classed separately.

If *ka·* of 2.1.15 above is, as suggested, a portmanteau, then Cl.-type 16 should be classed with the following, Cl.-type 16a.

4.16.a.   Clause-type 16a has the same basic meaning as the above, but the action or state expressed in the relative-result clause refers specifically to the future as indicated by the aspect marker, *ke*, for as yet uninitiated (or uncompleted), action. The syntagmeme differs also in one formal respect. It consists of three obligatory units of which the first is a fused particle, indicating both aspect and relative marker, ("hypertagmeme" at word level, where the slot is filled by a hypermorpheme), the second, a simple form, the resultative particle, *ohci*; and the third a complex item,- an intransitive verb in the conjunct order, consisting of an AI base, plus margin showing concord with the subject, as in 4.16. The minimum (and sole attested) form is as follows (2.2.1):

ke ohci pima·tisit, from which he might live: (< *ke*, fused form = rp plus uninitiated (future) action w. conj't. indic., *ohci*, from, as a result of; *pima·tisi-*, live; *-t*, 3 S, conjunct.)

Further exploration may show both 16 and 16a to belong to the same clause-type, or even to be in some way classifiable with 9. As indicated at the outset of this paper, the restricted body of material imposes a measure of inconclusiveness on any results. At the same time, within the limits set, the type of result and direction of tagmemic procedure should be clear.

4.17.1   Following discussion of Clause-types 1 and 2, an account was given in the direction of emic progression first on the phrase-level, and then on the level of word analysis. The following formulae represent an extension of this analysis in the light of clause-types in which the predicate is a verb in the conjunct indicative.

In the following formulae, "+" should be read as "occur(s)". At the word-level, only nouns and verbs are accounted for.

Nx = **NMod**: dem. pr/num. ptcl
        + **NH**: N (**N**: Nst ± **suff**: loc/obv.)
        + **NMod**: dem. pr + **Possessor**: possessor prefix +

> **NH**:N (+**NBase**:Nst + **possessor st**:-m -
> **suff**: -a3')

Lx = + L:frozen locative formation: (e.g., no·hcimihk) #
Postpositive: ohci/iši

    # **Demonstr've**: dem. pr. + **NH**:N (+ **NBase**: Nst
      + **suff**: loc. suff.) # **Postpositive**: ohci/iši

    + **L**: tetawaka·m + **NH**:N (+ **NBase**: Nst + **suff**:
      loc. suff.)

    + **L**: lp # **Postpositive**: ohci # **NH**: N (+ **NBase**:
      Nst + **suff**: loc. suff.)

Tx = + **Numerical**: peyakwa·

    + **Demonstr've**: dem. pr. inan.

4.17.2. Noun: Independent Stems

= # **NMod. st**: Nst/num. ptcl + **NBase**: Nst + **suff**:
    pl/loc/obv

= + **Init. st**: AI Base + **Vb. nominalizer**: ⌐-win⌐ +
    suff: pl/loc/obv
    Dependent Stems

= + **Possessor prefix**: -⌐w-⌐ + **dep. Nst**: ⌐-iyaw⌐.

Verb: The verb appears in the present material in the
conjunct order (indicative mode), and is always preceded by the
aspect marker, relative particle # ohci, or the purpose particle.

TV = # **Prebase**: init. st + **TBase**: TA St (+ **TCore**:
     TRoot + **Tst**: TAst) + **TA Margin**: TAsuff
     Sgpn-Ob.gn*

    # **Prebase**: init. st + **TBase**: TI#St (+ **TCore**: TRoot
     + **Tst**: TIst) /.../ (+ **VMod. st**: init. st. +
     VbCore: medial st + **Tst**: TIst) +
     + **TI Margin**: TIsuff$^{Sgpn-Ob.g.}$

IV = # **Intr. Prebase**: Init. st. + **IntrBase**: AI St ...
                                     II St ...

a) AI St (+ **ICore**: IRoot + **I.St**: AIst) /

b)   /(+ **Vb. action st**: init. st + **NOb**: Nst +
       I St: AIst) /

c)   /(+ **ICore Mod**: init st + **ICore**: Med. Vst —
       I St: AIst) + **AIMargin**: suff^{Sgpn}

a) is illustrated by **no·ko-si-**(**t**); **ki·we-t**; (Cf. p. 38, n. 13)

b) is illustrated by **natawi-mo·sw-e-**(**ya·hk**);

c) is illustrated by **seski-paht-a·-**(**t**); **kosko-pali-**(**ki**).

    II St (+ **ICore**: IRoot - **I. St**: IIst) + **IIMargin**:
    suff^{Sgpn}

Passives: **TA**: $++$ **TA Base**: TA St $+$ **Instr. suff**: ⊦-a·kan⊦
           — **Pred St**: ⊦-iwi-⊦ $+$ **AIMargin**: suff[83]
           Cf. 2.2.12; 2.2.13.

         $++$ **TA Base**: TA St $+$ Passive suff: ⊦-iht⊦[83]

     TI: $+$ **TI Base**: TI St $+$ **Inan. Intr. stem**:
           ⊦-ika·te -⊦ $+$ **Margin**: suff.[80] Cf. 2.1.1.d'.

     AI: $+$ **AI Core**: AIRoot $+$ **AI Passive***:
           ⊦-a·niwa-⊦ $+$ **IIMargin**: suff[80] Cf.2.2.13.

5.   The reader who has painstakingly worked his way through
the foregoing, or hopefully turned to the end for a neat summary.
may well be asking himself the value of tagmemic analysis.   If
the author may be forgiven for both over-stating and over-
simplifying at a stroke, the value of applied tagmemics might be
stated somewhat as follows.

     Every language has a given number of structural types at
any given level.   Whether choice falls on the full-sentence type.
clause-type, or some other as the basic working unit, is determined
largely by the inherent structure of the language and convenience
in handling. (one caveat: — the levels, sentence, clause, phrase,
word, etc., must always be kept in clear focus and never confused.)
The first step is to determine and list the minimum number of
these structural types required to account for all constructions
occurring.   The tagmemically based lesson material will then
state these and follow each with a set of drills designed to groove
the patterns home.

     When the student controls the structural types, he controls
the language !

<p style="text-align:center">★</p>

     Tagmemic analysis is for many still a new thing.   Yet the
body of literature in this important field already exceeds that in
glossematics, which has been under consideration by linguists for
some four or five times as long.   One notorious hurdle, the syn-
tactic threshold, has long withstood any really successful assault
on the part of the analyst.   Tagmemics, with its acceptance of
language as a mode of behaviour, operative on all levels at once.
offers one of the more hopeful approaches to the problem of
overall analysis in terms of a unified theory. It must be readily
admitted that tagmemic formulae do not make the lightest reading
imaginable; yet the practical value of tagmemics cannot be over-
estimated, and the method as such deserves more serious attention
on the part of both the analyst and the serious exponent of applied
linguistics.

<p style="text-align:center">●</p>

BOOK REVIEWS / COMPTES RENDUS CRITIQUES

●

¶ **A Short Introduction to English Grammar,** by James
Sledd.   Scarborough, W. J. Gage, 1959.   346 pp. $4.00.
(Reviewed by D. F. Theall, St. Michael's College, Toronto).

In a recent review in *Language,* Fred Householder criticized
the conservatism of Hockett's *a Course in Modern Linguistics.*
Anyone with such inclinations would be totally alarmed at
Sledd's *Short Introduction.*   Admittedly Sledd's purpose is quite
different from Hockett's.   His book is to provide a 'grammar
text' for the course in English composition.   Therefore, Sledd's
book is syncretistic, combining the traditional and the structural.
And, it is diagnostic, providing students with an infinitely more
intelligent composition handbook than has been available pre-
viously.   Therefore the fact that it makes a significant contribu-
tion to the field of grammar should be regarded as a major achieve-
ment.   In such a role it is infinitely superior to any text now
available to the teacher of such courses.

Perhaps the most important thing about Sledd's *Introduc-
tion* is that the author is scrupulously honest.   He does not in-
novate for the sake of innovation and he exhibits a high respect
for the traditions of English grammatical studies.   Consequently
he has written what he himself calls a "transitional book",
which combines the best elements of traditionalism with the
obvious advantages of modern structuralist approaches.   That
the author is not easily influenced by modern dogma can be seen
in his use of the Kenyon-Kurath transcription system (with mo-
difications) instead of the Smith-Trager system and in his dis-
missal of IC analysis as useless to English grammar. That the
author does not accept older solutions uncritically is demon-
strated by his attempt to establish word classes on two different
bases :   Class A by morphological formation and Class B by
positional criteria.   His extensive use of phonology in his
grammatical analyses and later in his section on applied grammar
(or the stylistics of expository composition) demonstrates his
ability to adapt newer methods of analysis when they appear
to be superior.   Not only does Sledd give attention to the oral
side of language, but he avoids most of the naïveté of the Latin
grammar tradition and the "grammar of usage".

This refreshing sense of critical judgment is bound to make Sledd's *Introduction* a useful book and the accompanying command of prudence is bound to make it a good book. His witty and urbane style is permeated by clarity and common sense, the sign of a writer who is both a linguist and a man of letters, although he prefers to be described by neither of these terms. If Ph.D.'s in English literature, as Sledd has described himself, can produce grammars like this, the title will become a badge of honor.

More seriously, however, an evaluation of Sledd's book presents difficulties. As the author himself carefully points out, a great deal of the treatment is adapted to the practical demands of a composition handbook, and naturally the practical demands of a text are of paramount importance. Yet such texts no matter what their purpose are also the student's first introduction to the study of language. The standard of further language study (and for that matter literary study) will be set by the nature of the introduction. With Sledd we have a master pedagogue approaching the problem. He argues that what we need at this stage is a series of transitional grammars, works which will ease the shift from the old schoolbook tradition to modern linguistics. *A Short Introduction to English Grammar*, as its title borrowed from Bishop Lowth's Eighteenth Century work suggests, is just this — a bridge between tradition and modernity. The assumption on which such a bridge is built is that there is a good deal in the older analyses of the language that is still sound and in fact that contemporary linguists have never produced grammatical works such as Zandvoort's *Handbook*, which Sledd reviewed so favorably in *Language*, 1957. Anyone who has worked closely with English can hardly help but agree with Sledd. Whitney, Sweet, Jespersen, Poutsma, Kruisinga and Zandvoort are still essential reference works and it will be a long time before they can be replaced.

On the other hand, each particular grammatical analysis seen in the light of modern linguistics should be a self-contained system or structure. Within its own terms it must be susceptible of logical analysis and be consistent and coherent. Eclecticism is very likely to result in just the type of phenomenon, which the modern linguist attempts to avoid — an approach which may be extremely rewarding in part, but which as a description of the language fails to have the standard of logical consistency and coherence demanded by scientific explanation. It is perfectly apparent that grammatical solutions, just like logical solutions, are non-unique, but it is equally apparent that they must be consistent and coherent.

Therefore, it would seem that one of the major points to be communicated to a student even at the freshman level is the

necessity for analytical tools, which are part of a coherent and consistent approach to language. Sledd's work does not seem to drive in the point that there is an art of grammar, which may result in different solutions, but the framework of each grammar must be rigidly consistent. It is at this point, however, that the pedagogical question enters in. Won't the end product be a good work on linguistics, such as Archibald Hill's *Introduction to Linguistic Structure,* but still be a poor work from the point of view of presentation to freshmen students ? Sledd has attempted to solve this, but he may have pushed a little too far in one direction, just as Hill's introduction pushes too far in the other. As Sledd himself observes, however, the dilemma is further complicated by the fact that teachers of English who have access to the students (and for that matter teachers of foreign languages, too) are often totally unfamiliar with sound linguistic practices.

Sledd's *Introduction* must be viewed with a full awareness of this situation. While admiring his book and recommending it for use at the present moment, it is necessary to disagree with his approach. Sledd's book, in stressing an easy transition, may possibly obliterate the reason why transition is necessary. More important, however, the pedagogical emphasis may easily mislead the teacher or the class even though it has not misled the author. This book probably demonstrates more pointedly than any previous work the problems of an age of transition in grammatical studies.

The work itself is divided into eight chapters and three parts. The first six chapters — the grammar proper — are the first part : 1. The Sounds of English; 2. The Parts of Speech; 3. Nominal Sequences; 4. Verbal Sequences; 5. Subjects and Predicates; 6. The Sentence and its Kinds. The grammar proper is followed by the second part, an extremely useful glossary of grammatical terms, which contrasts Sledd's use of terms with more traditional usage. This glossary is followed by Chapter 8 (part 3) — a chapter on Applied Grammar; Some Notes on English Prose Style. This last chapter deals with the application of the materials developed in the grammar to the problems of expository writing.

This chapter on stylistics would suggest that stylistics is an application of grammar. The chapter, however, suggests that it is and it isn't. It opens with the author's assertion that :

> "Throughout this book we have recognized that the English language can be described in more ways than one and that the grammarian's purpose will affect his choice of methods. Of the possible uses for a grammar, we have kept a very practical one in mind: the application of grammatical knowledge in the writing of exposition and argument. Our definition of the sentence was deliberately shaped to suit this purpose."

Now the issues raised by this introductory statement are vast. Most centrally it suggests that there are different theories of grammar, which are determined by the application to which the grammar will be put. Furthermore, it suggests a stand on the argument of the non-uniqueness of linguistic solutions and almost supports Hockett's views on the 'art of grammar'. But as a result of this it also suggests that pedagogical ends can deliberately shape scientific description, that the strategy and tactics of the grammarian should be determined by the application to which the grammar will be put.

If Sledd's contention is correct, then the description he has chosen should be the most appropriate for the purpose of applying grammar to the stylistics of expository composition. Yet further on, speaking of "Sentence Connection and Larger Units", Sledd observes :

> "In these areas the grammarian can by no means tell us all we need to know. Not only is the sentence his largest unit. Within that unit he deals mainly with forms, not meanings; but the connections among sentences are connections in meaning as well as form."

This would seem to assert that the grammatical analysis can only be determined by its application within limits. Two of these limits apparently are : first, that the largest unit of analysis is the sentence and second, that analysis must deal chiefly with forms rather than meanings. Yet Sledd himself has told us that his definition of the sentence was determined by demands of application. If the demands of application can determine the definition of the largest unit of linguistic analysis, aren't they also able to determine the nature of the unit ? Possibly Sledd means that the sentence is the largest unit for which descriptions are available, but this is certainly not the same thing as suggesting that it is the largest unit which the grammarian should concern himself. In fact, even before the grammarian becomes involved in stylistics the problem of anaphoric reference and the problem of determining question and answer types lead him into an area beyond the sentence.

In fact, the stylistic discussion very rapidly suggests, that some of the problems in the grammatical analysis are problems of units larger than the sentence. Sledd suggests that :

> "In English the most important transitional devices include the conjunctions, certain sentence adverbials (words, phrases and clauses), the pronouns and other nominals, some of the determiners and auxiliaries (in uses which may require statements about accompanying intonation patterns and stress patterns) some use of likeness and difference in sentence structure and some uses of synonyms or of verbal repetition."

Now certainly some of this must be the province of the

grammarian as well as the lexicographer. It is interesting, for example, to note that in the grammar proper Sledd never has an example of a sentence beginning with an initial "but", since such a sentence could only be handled by considering units larger than the sentence.

What seems to be the root of the whole problem is the definition of the sentence with which the author ends up. He finally adopts the view that a sentence must contain a complete subject and a complete predicate. Although Sledd makes it clear that he realizes this is a purely functional definition of the sentence for his particular purposes, it leads him into making some rather awkward analyses. First, if the sentence is defined as Sledd defines it, it becomes necessary to speak of all utterances which do not have a complete subject and complete predicate, but do have a sentence type intonation pattern as sentence fragments. This suggests that they are in some way incomplete. This is an awkward way of handling a response such as "Yes" or "Montreal" in reply to the question "Where are you going today ?" Such incompleteness would lead back to talking of ellipsis, which Sledd rightly castigates in his glossary. This is of minor seriousness ,however, but it leads to a second problem with respect to the so-called English imperative. Sledd suggests :

> "...we must now make one exception to our subject-predicate rule. Commands or imperatives, which our conventions of end punctuation in writing make it best to treat as complete sentences, do not always contain a subject. We can say either :
>
> > ³ stóp + thàt' ↘
>
> or
>
> > ³ yõu + stóp + thàt'
>
> without much change of meaning."

The exception is an awkward one and shows the weakness of the analytical definition chosen — a rather serious link with traditionalism. Might it not be better to define sentence in suprasegmental terms so as to include all of the sentence fragments and then to speak of two classes of sentence types or three ? The complete subject-complete predicate sentence could be treated as a favorite sentence type or as a canonical form for generating important features of the syntactical system of word order. There is no reason why this would ultimately interfere with composition writing and the grammatical presentation would be considerably strengthened.

This still leaves another problem with respect to the imperative — the imperative with a subject. Sledd suggests with respect to the second example above that "we can often add as subject the nominal *you*." Suprasegmentally, this position which treats "you" as the subject is weak. If we were to consider the sentence "You come to class everyday, in the

context, "You're O.K. You come to class everyday." there is a distinct difference between "you" as subject and "you" as vocative. In fact, in some dialects they may occur in different form /yə/ vs /yuw/. Consequently there would seem to be apt reason for talking of a vocative distinct from the subject. This would also cover Sledd's cases such as :

"Everybody get in there and pitch."

Here part of the problem in analysis is the fact that the model form of the sentence as defined has been allowed to obtrude into the analytical structure. Economy, simplicity, coherence and consistency all would have resulted from a slight shifting of the traditional structure.

Another query to be raised is whether the emphasis on expository composition doesn't fail in assisting the student in another equally important aspect of English studies, stylistics. Sledd himself warns that :

"The label sentence fragment must not, of course, suggest that we never do or never should write or say anything which does not contain a subject and a predicate and we must not forget in limiting our discussion to complete sentences and neglecting the sentence fragment we are deliberately choosing for our own special purposes, to neglect a substantial part of the English language."

This neglect could result in two weaknesses, first, it integrates the book around composition in such a manner as to make it far less effective as an introduction to English stylistics in a broader literary sense and second, it may even weaken this as a composition text, for certainly the student's sensitivity to the whole language is important to his comprehension of the special written dialect employed in expository composition.

To take issue with such items in the book is not meant to detract from the extensive analysis, which is excellent. The presentation of suprasegmental and segmental phonology is a masterful combination of good style, sound pedagogy and good linguistic analysis. The treatment of the three objects in the English Predicate is important and unique. Sentences such as "Elect me Stevenson president next year", said Truman" clearly demonstrate the three object structure and provide an excellent beginning for analytical solution of the object complement structure. Sledd's analysis of Parts of Speech raises the interesting possibility of employing positional and morphological criteria to separate the two large groups of word classes. While one may question details of this analysis, the fundamental distinction is important. Further work along this line will probably prove that the author's analysis is too simplified (for example with respect to relatives where neither positional nor morphological criteria seem to mark their class but rather features of anaphora and agreement). While one might query whether nominals,

verbals, adjectivals, etc. (as distinct from nouns, verbs, adjectives) function at the same level as prepositions, conjunctions, relatives, etc., it is not yet possible to demonstrate that they don't and the lumping of these together in a positional set of word classes creates interesting analytical problems.   It might be expected that Prof. Sledd's solution in particular details is tentative, but his suggestion is important.

Before closing, however, it is necessary to take issue with two other features of the book.   The first concerns the idiolect and transcription system; the second, the dismissal of IC analysis.

Transcription System. This reviewer does not consider the incompatibility of the Sledd idiolect sufficient reason for abandoning the Smith-Trager transcription system.   In spite of Prof. Sledd's critiques of Smith and Trager, it is still the most efficient system for most dialects of North American English.   This is not the place to re-canvas a long and thorny discussion, however.

Idiolect. If the practical demands of the classroom situation were paramount in defining the sentence they should have also been paramount in selecting the dialect to be used for examples.   Sledd's idiolect is extremely interesting to a specialist in phonology, but in most universities it cannot help being extremely confusing to students.   Writing in Toronto, I have been unable to check any of the transcriptions because of the unavailability of informants of a similar dialect background. Certainly a more familiar dialect would have been a great aid to Freshman teachers who could have found Chicagoans more readily than Georgians.   I am not certain whether it is a function of the idiolect or not, but certain of Sledd's intonation markings would present serious problems to New York or mid-Western speakers.   (e.g., pp. 139, 170, 172, 167, 181).

Immediate Constituents. Sledd has rejected using any technique nown as immediate constituent analysis on the grounds that "the analyses which have so far been proposed differ widely among themselves and are often quite arbitrary."   This is perhaps a wise decision, but might it not have been more instructive and a better introduction to the problems of language analysis to have shown at some point divergent possibilities of analysis ?   An Introduction always avoids the dogmatic, but it seldom provides the experimental as such.   Some discussion of division by twos and other forms of hierarchical analysis would have provided the student with a sense of the complexity of language.   Furthermore it would have prepared the way for more advanced study in linguistics and it is Sledd himself who holds out such great hope for Chomsky's transformational studies which depend on IC analysis.

In conclusion, however, Sledd must be complimented on
having achieved what he set out to do and having achieved it
better than any text-book writer so far.   When *A Short Intro-
duction* is set against any existing traditional handbook on the
one side, or any of the obvious modern text-books on the other, it
rates the highest praise.   Surpassed for modern linguistic pre-
sentation only by Hill and Hockett, who are writing for more
sophisticated students and surpassed as a traditional book only
by the great names of the English grammatical tradition, Sledd's
transitional work is a achievement deserving praise.   To have
failed to criticize its particular details, however, would have been
to misunderstand Sledd's own intention, which is to add to our
knowledge by providing one of many text-books needed in an
age of transition.

<p style="text-align:center">★</p>

¶ **Eléments de syntaxe structurale,** par Lucien Tesnière.
Paris, Klincksieck, 1959, 670 pages.   (Compte rendu de E.
Richer, S.J., Université de Montréal).

Un ouvrage courageux, destiné à faire époque.   Désormais,
il sera bien entendu que la syntaxe n'a pas à chercher ses lois hors
d'elle-même :   discipline à la fois différente et indépendante de
la morphologie, d'une part, de la logique et de la psychologie,
d'autre part, la syntaxe a pour objet *la forme intérieure de la
phrase*, i.e. *le jeu de connexions* qu'est l'ensemble organisé du
langage humain.

Il faut savoir gré à MM. Fourquet et Daumas d'avoir ren-
du possible la publication d'une étude aussi importante.   Les
linguistes théoriciens, les maîtres, les étudiants trouveront, dans
les 700 pages de Tesnière, matière à fructueuses méditations sur
le mécanisme de l'expression de la pensée.   Nous nous plaisons
même à y voir la source de certaines améliorations éventuelles
dans l'enseignement de la syntaxe.   L'exposition graduée et
convaincante des phénomènes de structure, telle que sortie de la
plume de l'A., est appelée à rendre d'éminents services, en met-
tant de l'ordre dans des notions de base jusqu'ici mal classées ou
gauchement interprétées.

Quatre thèmes fondamentaux nous paraissent contribuer à
l'originalité du travail.

Le premier consiste à démasquer hardiment les maladresses,
les incongruités et les dérobades de la grammaire traditionnelle,
accoutumée à effectuer des prouesses sur quatre plans à la fois :
ceux de la logique, de la morphologie, de la sémantique et de la
syntaxe proprement dite.   Tesnière fait voir avec une remar-
quable netteté que le caractère linéaire de la chaîne parlée est le

résultat d'une opération extrêmement délicate, par laquelle le sujet parlant fait en quelque sorte passer au laminoir la charpente même de la phrase. Autrement dit, c'est la "quadrature du cercle", car il y a antinomie entre l'ordre structural (essentiellement à plusieurs dimensions) et l'ordre linéaire (essentiellement à une dimension, à cause du développement de la parole et de l'écrit dans le temps et dans l'espace). La fonction propre de la *syntaxe* est d'effectuer l'opération inverse, i.e., pour conserver la figure, de retrouver le "cercle" sous-jacent au "carré". Tesnière nous y amène d'un pas sûr, grâce à l'utilisation du *stemma* ou représentation graphique de "la phrase structurale, dont la phrase linéaire n'est que l'image projetée tant bien que mal, et avec tous les inconvénients d'aplatissement que comporte cette projection, sur la chaîne parlée." (p. 20). Le structural, dont on use pour exprimer le sémantique, comporte, comme ce dernier, plusieurs dimensions : à défaut de se reporter aux divers niveaux structuraux, la syntaxe ne se libérera jamais de la sémantique, de la morphologie et de la logique.

Que nous enseigne, alors, la *phrase structurale* ? La réponse à cette question exprime le deuxième grand thème du livre : l'examen de la phrase structurale nous révèle "qu'il y a deux espèces de mots essentielles, les mots pleins et les mots vides" (p. 53). Demeurant bien entendu que "la notion de phrase est logiquement antérieure à celle de mot" (p. 25) et que "les coupures qui délimitent le mot sur la chaîne parlée sont non seulement *imprécises*, mais *imprécisables*" (p. 27), on s'aperçoit que toutes les opérations sémantiques et structurales se font en relation avec quatre espèces fondamentales de mots pleins : les *substantifs*, les *verbes*, les *adjectifs* et les *adverbes*.

Or, voilà que ces quatre espèces de mots pleins, utilisés presque toujours conjointement avec des mots vides (outils grammaticaux servant à diversifier la structure de la phrase), se portent au secours de la pensée, en s'organisant hiérarchiquement entre eux : nous avons le troisième grand thème, celui du *noeud*. Le noeud est "constitué par le régissant et par tous les subordonnés qui, à un degré quelconque, directement ou indirectement, dépendent de lui, et qu'il *noue* ainsi en quelque sorte en un seul faisceau" (p. 14). Si "toute la syntaxe structurale repose sur les rapports qui existent entre l'ordre structural et l'ordre linéaire" (p. 19), l'ordre structural, à son tour, repose entièrement sur cette *fonction nodale* que nous venons de décrire. Comme s'il gardait toujours présent à l'esprit le mot de F. de Saussure, selon lequel "toute définition faite à propos d'un mot est vaine; c'est une mauvaise méthode que de partir des mots pour définir les choses" (CLG, 1931, p. 31), Tesnière a pointé son microscope directement sur la structure et a noté ce qu'il observait. Ses découvertes ont un cachet original, une saveur personnelle, et on se défend mal d'y trouver quelque chose de vraiment emballant.

On sent que la vérité est là, derrière la porte qui vient de s'ouvrir !   C'est ainsi, par exemple, qu'on réagit agréablement devant des affirmations comme celles-ci :   "Dans aucune langue, aucun fait proprement linguistique n'invite à opposer le sujet au prédicat." (p. 104) — "On peut sans hésiter avancer, ce qui semble au premier abord paradoxal, mais est facilement démontrable si l'on précise qu'il s'agit purement du point de vue structure, et non du point de vue sémantique, que le *sujet est un complément comme les autres.*" (p. 109) — "On ne dira jamais assez qu'il n'y a pas de *mode conditionnel* en français et quel mal peut faire à la saine conception grammaticale du français la fausse notion de ce prétendu mode dont les limites d'emploi ne concordent d'ailleurs pas avec celles de l'expression de la condition, puisqu'il ne l'exprime qu'exceptionnellement et qu'il sert par contre couramment à exprimer tout autre chose." (p. 592).

Enfin, le quatrième grand thème, celui que Tesnière développe le plus longuement, c'est celui de la *translation*.   Phénomène de la dernière importance, la translation "consiste à transférer un mot plein d'une *catégorie* grammaticale dans une autre catégorie grammaticale, c'est-à-dire à transformer une espèce de mots en une autre espèce de mots." (p. 364).   Le mécanisme de la translation est un des phénomènes les plus courants du langage ordinaire et prouve avec une évidente clarté l'indépendance du structural par rapport au sémantique.   C'est tout spécialement au chapitre de cette translation, qu'on trouvera la solution adéquate à plus d'une "énigme" grammaticale, et, surtout, qu'on touchera du doigt les faits véritables d'une syntaxe digne de ce nom.

Les notations consciencieuses et les conclusions judicieuses de l'A. font des *Eléments de syntaxe structurale* une oeuvre vraiment tonique avec laquelle il faut désormais compter.

L'édition d'un pareil ouvrage représentait, nous le savons, une besogne immense et parfois délicate.   Désireux, pourtant, qu'un livre de cette importance se présentât dans une tenue parfaite, nous regrettons qu'un nombre très considérable d'erreurs se soient glissées à travers l'écrit entier.   En fait, on en découvre quelque 300 (en 700 pages), dont moins de 100 seulement nous sont signalées à la fin du volume et sur une feuille insérée. Souhaitons qu'une édition ultérieure se rapproche plus visiblement de la perfection même matérielle, pour le plaisir et le profit des lecteurs de toutes catégories.

★

¶ **French Pronunciation and Diction,** by Jean C. Batt.   London, Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1958. xviii - 146 pp. $1.30.   (Reviewed by R. Gregg, University of British Columbia).

A lot of water has flowed under the bridge since the turn

of the century when the first books appeared in English on the subject of French phonetics (Benjamin Dumville, the D. L. Savory-D. Jones translation of Paul Passy, G. G. Nicholson, etc.). These pioneers were followed in the thirties by Lilias E. Armstrong and in the forties by André Classe and now Miss Batt takes her place in this worthy succession with a book on French pronunciation which is accurate, readable and commendably compact.

Miss Batt begins by giving some general advice on the acquisition of a good pronunciation, emphasising the importance of certain factors characteristic of connected speech, viz., syllable division, stress and intonation. This is followed by a detailed study of the French vowel system which is compared with the English, and by a third chapter dealing with the relationship between the vowel sounds and their orthographic representation. This extremely important part of the student's work is rightly stressed here, for occasionally in the past phoneticians have tended to gloss over normal spelling as irrelevant to their purpose, yet nothing is more discouraging than to listen to a student who exhibits in his reading a perfect mastery of the individual French speech sounds but who has failed to equate them correctly to the graphic symbols.

The French syllabification and stress systems are dealt with next and compared with the English. A section on the complex problems involved in the pronunciation and omission of the *schwa*, and one dealing with the semi-vowels precede a detailed account of the consonantal system. Assimilation, liaison and intonation each receive careful treatment, and in the form of appendixes the author has added notes on the reading aloud of poetry, some passages for practice in the reading of phonetic script and a highly valuable list showing the correct pronunciation of words commonly mispronounced.

From the point of view of clarity it is a pity that the printers did not do something to distinguish the phonetic symbols from the rest of the text either by enclosing them in the conventional square brackets or by using a bold face type. It is especially confusing when the phonetic symbol (used in isolation) coincides with a letter of the normal alphabet. The placing of the stress mark over or at the end of the stressed syllable seems also to be an innovation of doubtful value.

The tables and diagrams are in general clear and well set out although the shape of conventionalised vowel chart on p. 13 and elsewhere involves needless distortions as compared with the outline of the actual tongue positions. The chart form used by D. Jones in his various books represents a safer compromise between accuracy and simplicity.

These are small faults, however, in comparison with the merits of the book. As the foreword emphasises it is not an

abstract treatise on phonetic theory but a valuable tool for the practical teaching of French pronunciation. The student's problems are kept in focus throughout and the author's clear exposition is re-inforced by the provision of a set of phonograph records which illustrate certain portions of the text.

★

¶ **On Translation** edited by R. A. Brower. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1959. X+297 pp.

¶ **Aspects of Translation,** Studies in Communication, contributed to the Communications Research Centre, University College, London. London, Secker and Warburg, 1958. 145 pp.

(Reviewed by J. Darbelnet, Bowdoin College).

These two books, hereafter referred to as OT and AT respectively, are collections of essays by various scholars. They cover a wide range from the rendering of poetry to the development of machine translation. Several papers are devoted to the turning of Greek and Latin into English, and two, one in each volume, deal with Chinese. OT also includes a critical bibliography of works on translation chronologically arranged by B. Q. Morgan, which should prove invaluable as a research tool.

Such diversity is at the expense of unity not only in the ideas expressed, which is to be expected, but also in the terminology used. It would be impossible in the short space of a review to do justice to all the aspects of translation touched on here from a variety of angles. The reviewer will therefore limit himself to those concepts that seem the most fruitful.

It helps our general understanding of the subject to be reminded by two of the authors that translation is actually part of a general process of transmutation which operates a) between two languages (as we have always known), b) within the same language (as when we rewrite and adapt), c) between thought and word, when we speak or write. Jackson Mathews (OT 74) quotes Valéry as saying that any writing that requires thought is a work of translation, and Renato Poggioli (OT 144) recalls that symbolists viewed original poetry as a rephrasing of heavenly music. From a somewhat different standpoint Roman Jakobson (OT 233) distinguishes three types of translation : 1) intralingual (rephrasing) in the same language, possibly at a different level of speech), 2) interlingual (which is translation proper) and 3) intersemiotic, in which verbal signs are turned into non-verbal ones and vice versa.

These views will not appear merely academic if we grasp their implication that content can be separated from form, since in the above transmutations we change the form of meaning. Disagreement is to be expected here, especially from those concerned with the translation of poetry. We are told that "we cannot always dissociate content from form" (AT 1), that "in poetic experience meaning and form are not apprehended seperately, but operate together" (AT 23), that "imagery is a vehicle of communication" (AT 15), that "art is not an aspect of form but rather a mysterious and hidden component of content" (OT 141), all this to say that change of form is a change of meaning. But a different note is sounded by those whose material is more didactic than poetic. Writing on Bible translating, Eugene Nida rules that "when one must be abandoned for the sake of the other, the meaning must have priority over the stylistic forms" (OT 19) and even though concerned with problems of style in translation from French L. W. Oancock (AT 30) places accuracy of meaning first.

Both volumes take up the question of editing : should the translator edit the author ? Richard Lattimore (OT 49) seems to imply that this may be necessary when Greek is translated into English in order to attune the rendering to the ear of the English reader. From the other end of the spectrum Leonard Forster (AT 6) comes to the same conclusion for a different reason, taking as his example a piece of technical writing, the clarity of which could and should be improved by the translator. On the other hand, judging from the mid-point of fiction L. W. Tancock (AT 48) cautions against changes that would alter the personality of the author. If Zola, for instance, causes one of his characters to shift unexpectedly from broken illiterate speech to an eloquent evocation of a socialist future, that is his responsibility and it should remain so in the translation.

Closely related to editing is the matter of local colour. As graphically described by G. Mounin, quoted by Forster (AT 16), there are two schools of thought in this respect. The "clear glass" school contends that the best translation should read like the original, while for the "coloured glass" school the reader "must not be allowed to forget that what he is reading is foreign in origin and that is one of its essential qualities."

Nida (OT 19) thinks that "a good translation should not reveal its non-native source". But most of the contributors who touch on this point seem to agree that because we still live in a romantic age, we value local colour and are disappointed when it is kept out.

This brings up one of the best illustrated ideas in either book, namely the contemporaneous quality of translation which stems from the fact that we can read only from a particular point in space and time. It follows that the translator of liter-

ary works has a twofold obligation to "the demanding complexity of his own artistic insight" and to the taste and interest of his readers. Hence the need for each age to re-translate the classics. The six translations of *Agamemnon* adduced by Reuben Brower (AT) in proof of this, are shown to reflect the ideas of each period not only on diction, which might be expected, but even on social outlook. For instance, it is significant that the most recent translation of Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* should substitute "honest dealing" for "Justice" in the abstract, a change which accords with the prevalence of operational definitions and the shift from essence to existence. For a similar reason, Shakespeare has become, to the German, a member of the eighteenth century tradition because he was translated by writers of that period (AT 21), a fact which still colours German criticism of his plays.

Both books devote one essay each to machine translation. The point is made by A. Oettinger (OO 240 and 258) that apart from its practical value which is still in the future, machine translation will foster an analytical view of language which will be of interest to translators in general, and, one might add, to linguists. Moreover the development of an automatic dictionary will bring in its wake vast quantities of material which could facilitate concordance making and determine more speedily the range of current usage.

On the whole both studies (Oettinger's in OT and A. D. Booth's in AT) are guarded in tone and refrain from claiming more than the processing of scientific texts, which are likely to be free from idiom. But somewhere else we are reminded that "scientists and technicians do not always deal with facts, though they like us to think they do; often they deal with theories and sometimes even with mere opinions" (AT 7). This would tend further to limit the scope of the machine. Perhaps the answer lies, as has already been suggested, in the use of pre- and post-editors. One reader would remove from the original such ambiguities or idioms as might prove stumbling blocks, another would revise the end product for smoothness. Eventually such a solution might well put the pressure on scientific writers to adopt a style that fits the machine instead of expecting the machine to adjust to what few slight vagaries they may still possess.

The two main difficulties arise from recalling context and storing enough rules in the machine so that it can handle as many constructions as possible. For instance (this is my own example) the machine would have to know that after *prendre, à* is to be rendered by *at* and not by *to*. But can it solve the ambiguities contained in the following : "Il a pris l'argent à son père" (again my own example), "she cannot bear children", "these men are revolting" (AT 103) ? It would seem that pre-editing is almost a necessity.

The linguistic aspects of translation have received less attention than, for instance, the problem of poetic creation in the target language. There are only four essays by linguists, or six if we include those on machine translation, out of a total of twenty-four. It is clear that the other contributors are not oriented toward linguistics. In discussing the translation of poetry one of them makes a very perceptive remark but apologizes for it in the same breath. Comparing St. John Perse's "la course des rats sur les débris de verre" with T. S. Eliot's original "rats' feet over broken glass" (AT 72) he explains French avoidance of concreteness by the static nature of French prepositions, "if the point is not too boring". Boring, indeed ! This is one of the most illuminating remarks one can make in a functional comparison of French and English. It accounts for the impossibility of saying "A la gare" for "To the Station", and it relates to the structure of both languages.

The impact of divergent structures on translation is dealt with to some extent in the linguistic essays . We are shown how one language has to be more explicit than another because it has a dual or distinguishes between the perfective and the imperfective. As Jakobson puts it (OT 236) languages differ essentially in what they *must* convey and not in what they *may* convey.

Differences of structure may lead to overtranslation as exemplified by Nida's remark on connectives. Because these relational words are very common in Greek they do not stand out as much as they do in English where they assume the significance of lesser frequency. This, by the way, is also true of French, where "en effet" appears more often than its dictionary equivalent — inadequate at that — does in English. If Greek and French connectives are always translated the result will be overtranslation and a strained effect in English. The principle is very well put by Nida (OT 25) : whatever is normally implicit in the target language should be allowed to remain so, even though it happens to render something which the source language usually makes explicit. Conversely, what is normal in the source language should not appear conspicuous in the target language. The accepted translation of "Kennst du das Land . . ." is "Knowst thou the land . . ." It is a stylistic overtranslation, for *du* is everyday speech while *thou* is archaic; moreover *land* in the sense of "country" is more poetic in English than in German (AT 4).

Two interesting observations are made in the field of semantics. Nida warns (OT 26) that we should not expect generic terms to occur on the same level in two different languages the way specific terms do. He is thinking of primitive languages, but his remark is equally applicable to French versus English. There is no obvious generic term in English for *pâtes d'Italie*

or *charcuterie,* and *fruit de mer* is very much like *seafood* but not quite. Also related to linguistic analysis is the concept of semantic constituent (OT 25) under which words are compared with regard to their range of substitution. A word that permits substitution will be higher on the ladder of abstraction than one that does not.

Strangely enough very little attention is paid in these volumes to the question of translation units. Perhaps this disregard is more surprising to someone who has given the matter some attention. Leonard Forster (AT 11) considers three kinds of units : the individual word, the sentence or phrase, the whole work. I should be tempted to omit the sentence from the second category and to analyze phrases more in detail. The example Forster gives at this point, namely Luther's insertion of *allein* in his translation of Romans 3.28, has little relation to the process of segmentation by which units can be marked off. As for the unit being the whole work, I again would disagree. The total message includes elements of emphasis, tone, stylistic expression which may have to be shifted for reasons of structure. But the shift will be from the unit where this particular element would normally have appeared to one before or after, in which the translator finds it convenient to insert it. In other words the segmentation is the groundwork and underlies all the deviations from literal translation. Shifts are permissible as long as the global effect remains the same.

Sound advice is given (AO 31) to the effect that the translator must emancipate himself from the word, but the leeway he may allow himself in doing so still has to be determined. Rabin (AT 131) tends to reduce translation to either literalness or paraphrase. It is difficult to countenance such a view when one remembers how often students have been confused by this choice between a literal and a loose translation, for it misses the point : a translation has to be accurate, but it can be literal and inaccurate, and it can also be exact even if structured differently. Let us not forget that *He is sure to come* is not *Il est sûr de venir,* and that *It's all I can do to tell . . .* is a very accurate rendering of *J'ai déjà bien du mal à distinguer . . .* In our *Stylistique comparée,* J.-P. Vinay and I have tried to chart the area between literalness and paraphrase, in which we feel some of the best translations are to be found.

On the whole, and allowing for a certain amount of padding, these two symposiums provide insights which can contribute to a rationale of translation. It is regrettable, however, that the emphasis should have been more on translation as an art than on translation as a science. It is for linguists to establish the ground rules that will ensure accuracy of meaning, a thing which standard translations do not always achieve. Above this basis the literary translator, especially if he works in poetry, can

and should use his own judgment to solve problems that call for
a subjective approach in terms of both the translator and the
reader.   For it is true to say that at a certain level translation is
more an art than a science, but even so it has to rely on techni-
ques evolved from linguistic analysis.

★

¶ *The Structure of American English,* by W. Nelson Francis.
New York, The Ronald Press Company, 1958.   Pp. 614.

(Reviewed by M. H. Scargill, University of Alberta at Calgary
and Walter S. Avis, Royal Military College, Kingston).

— 1 —

In recent years a number of university English teachers have
been demanding a book that would present the findings of
modern linguists as they relate to English. *The Structure of
American English* is one of the most recent of the very few
books written to meet that demand. As such, *The Structure of
American English* will doubtless come into the hands of more
and more teachers, with varying degrees of linguistic knowledge,
who are looking for a text for courses within an English depart-
ment in a university. It is, therefore, important to consider just
how good a text this is. Will it meet the requirements of uni-
versity teachers? Is it full enough to stand alone as a text or
does it need considerable supplementing from other sources?

This year *The Structure of American English* has been
used in two courses at the University of Alberta's Summer School
of Linguistics. It has, therefore, been put to a test which is
considerably more rigorous than the most careful scrutiny of a
reviewer who has not tried the book in the classroom. The two
courses were Modern English Grammar (M. H. Scargill) and
Linguistic Geography (M. S. Avis).

Both Dr. Avis and I have found the book to be a great
help, and we feel that it is a valuable publication. Since we
used different parts of the book in our quite different courses, we
have decided that it might be a good idea to present a type of
"joint review". I shall confine myself largely to the chapters
on *Grammar.* Dr. Avis will deal mainly with the chapters on
phonetics, phonemics, and American dialects.

But before I move to my separate criticisms and Dr. Avis
to his, we should say that this comprehensive study of American
English is, in its author's words, "intended for upper-division
undergraduates and graduate students making their first aquaint-
ance with the study of the English language as an end in itself.

No previous training in linguistics is needed in order to use it."
(p.iii). That is, this is a book written at university level to be
used in a course which the author [and your reviewers] believe
"all English majors and candidates for the master's degree should
have." (p. iii)

The Structure of American English begins with a com-
petent chapter entitled "Language, Languages, and Linguistic
Science". It then proceeds through phonetics, phonemics, mor-
phemics, grammar, American dialects to "Linguistics and the
Teacher of English." A convenient Glossary of terminology and
a useful General Bibliography end the book.

Unfortunately for my own students this year, when the
prescribed texts were named, I did not know enough about *The
Structure of American English* to be able to recommend it. Some
time later, when I was convinced of its value, it was too late to
"require" it of the students in my class. Professor Francis' book,
then, has not been used as a text for study in class (although
I believe that many students have now bought it); but it has
provided me with much helpful material for lectures; and I
assume, therefore, that it would do the same for others wishing
to give a first course in Modern English.

However, this raises a difficult question. There are
teachers of English in universities who are interested in "teach-
ing grammar" but who, for various reasons, feel that they have
not had sufficient experience of linguistics to embark on the
venture. Would this book alone be enough for a "beginning
instructor" as well as for a beginning student ? I think that it
would not. And I advise an instructor to make himself famil-
iar with other works before he thinks of actually presenting a
course in English grammar. Many of these works are listed in
the bibliography in *The Structure of American English*.

Chapters 3 and 4 of Francis' book, "Phonemics" and
"Morphemics", present a competent introduction to a complex
and complicated subject. I found these chapters all that an in-
structor with a beginning, adult class could require. Quite prop-
erly, the author has made no attempt to suppress technical
terms : but he has admirably explained and illustrated them.

The chapters which deal with *Grammar* (5, 6 and 7)
under the headings "The Parts of Speech", "Syntactic Struc-
tures", and "Sentences" represent for me most clearly the
strength and weakness of the book. It is in these chapters that
Francis has, he says, put forward some "new notions". But
these chapters are bound to reflect very clearly the ideas presented
in particular by Fries in his impressive *The Structure of English;*
and they suffer at times from the same faults of generalization.

I find that on occasion Francis in his eagerness to show
the superiority of modern techniques of analysis is guilty of an

inconsistency which might give great pleasure to unsympathetic critics and which might also get an instructor into an unproductive "argument" with his students. For example, on p. 293, Francis explains that "Systems of diagramming that depend on rearrangement . . . conceal grammatical structure instead of revealing it. In contrast, the system here will have the words in the order in which they appear." But on p. 342, in dealing with the structure *rather than starve he chose to eat insects,* Francis says, "This is most simply analyzed as an inversion of *he chose to eat insects rather than starve."* Similarly, in his analysis of *I like fresh fish not salted* on p. 361, Francis says . . . "analysis is made simpler by assuming an imaginary or omitted repetition of *fish . . ."* True, he is at pains to explain in a footnote on p. 362 that "This type of analysis must not be confused with the indiscriminate use of 'understood' elements common in some traditional grammars . . ."

Now this seems to me a very fine distinction. Do modern analysts supply or rearrange words or don't they ? If they do, why hide the fact ? If they don't, then why do it ?

On p. 257 and on p. 333 Francis introduces the verb *get* as an auxiliary verb. This, of course, is not new with Francis. This verb, according to some linguists, is an auxiliary used to form the inchoative aspect of the verb : *we got talking.*

This puzzles me. And it puzzles other people, too.

Certainly English has the means to indicate the inception of an action. One way is to use verbs with the suffix *-en* : *The sky darkens.* Another way is to use a combination of two verbs : *It becomes dark; We began talking,* and so on.

But I cannot see why *gets* in such a structure should be singled out as an "auxiliary" but *began* or *started* are not. Perhaps there is something here about which I am ignorant. But since Francis makes no comment on this use of *gets,* I and others who use his book will have to remain ignorant to the amused tolerance of our students.

My own understanding of an auxiliary verb is that it is one that shows certain distinctive features. For example, some auxiliaries have only one form : *ought, must.* An auxiliary may be recognized by the fact that it can form a question by a simple reversal *(Does he dance ?)* or it can indicate negation by *not (He must not dance).* Verbs which are not auxiliaries cannot do these things *(Did they get talking ? He doesn't get to dance).* An auxiliary verb may often be recognized by its reduced stress.

Now, the verb *gets* meets none of the above requirements. Nor, for that matter, does *begins* or *starts* or *becomes.*

Personnally, I'd be happy to see a broadening of the con-

cept of "auxiliary" to include such structures as *got talking, began to run, kept reading* (iterative aspect ?), and so on. But I feel that the isolated and unexplained claim for *gets* alone as an auxiliary does harm.

On p. 303 Francis, quite rightly, shows a verb as a modifier of a noun : *the man to see.* On p. 341 he shows the same arrangement of forms as a structure of predication : *him to call.* It doesn't take long for a bright student to ask, "Just what are the structural signals that enable us to distinguish a structure of modification *(I want the money to spend)* from a structure of predication *(I want the man to go) ?*

Francis doesn't explain this for me. The only signal that I know here is lexical. Perhaps there is only a lexical signal. If this is so, why not admit it ? On p. 359, Francis does appeal to "lexical probability" to solve a similar ambiguity in structures of coordination.

On p. 299, Francis approaches the problem involved in the modification of a noun by a noun : in one case the possessive as a modifier *(that woman's doctor)*, in the other the noun-adjunct as a modifier *(that woman doctor).* He explains that such a pair as this illustrates the difference ("formal" and "in meaning") between the two structures of modification. According to Francis, *that woman's doctor* "transforms into" *the doctor of that woman* whereas *that woman doctor* "transforms into" *that doctor who is a woman.* This may well be true. But it is not true of *that child psychologist,* which does not "transform into" *that psychologist who is a child.* This brief excursion into transformation theory is not successful. And Francis does not tell us at this stage that the suprasegmentals come into play in such structures as *that child psychologist* and *that child pianist (a pianist who is a child).*

I have considered it my duty to advise prospective users of this book that they should be ready with answers (not necessarily mine) in these problematic cases. And there are other such cases. For example, I find it difficult to accept *wild* as an adjective modifying a verb in *the children ran wild* on p. 318. It seems to me more like an adverb of the *fast, hard* type.

However, in spite of these difficulties, I would still require *The Structure of American English* as a text in any course in English grammar. I should warn my students that its weaknesses are often weaknesses in the structuralist description as a whole. But I could tell students that, at the time of writing, I consider Francis, book the most clearly written and most informative *single work of its kind* that they can buy.

M. H. Scargill

In agreeing with Professor Scargill's view that *The Struc-ture of American English* is an important publication, I would like to stress the engaging style of presentation. Dr. Francis writes in a lucid, easy-going manner, presenting the sometimes difficult ideas basic to an understanding of linguistics without the frustrating abstruseness so often encountered in books on this subject. He never forgets that his readers are learners; yet he does not talk down to them. He defines his terms clearly, uses analogies aptly, and, as a rule, places coherence before brevity.

The one unsatisfactory result of this expansiveness is a book awkward to handle as a classroom text, for the more than six hundred thick pages stand all of two inches high. For all that, the size and style of type, the spacing of the lines and the generous margins make for an attractive page.

"The Sounds of Speech : Phonetics" is the title of Chap-ter 2, which includes a full discussion, with appropriate dia-grams, of the speech act, the speech organs, the articulatory classification of the speech sounds, and the symbols and diacritics used to represent them in phonetic recording. The types of sounds most likely to be heard in English are described and il-lustrated, the examples, for the most part, being drawn from American regional speech. Other varieties of English are used to illustrate phone-types not commonly heard in America, for example, the flap of British *very* and the voiceless velar fricative of Scottish *loch*. Considering limitations of space, a fair range of phone-types is presented. I personally think Francis missed a trick in not calling attention to the occurrence of a voiced velar fricative in such words as *sugar* and *slugger;* I recall how astounded I was to learn that this phone occurred in modern English.

The symbols used are those of the International Pho-netic Association with minor modifications that we are ac-customed to seeing in North America. The descriptive nomen-clature follows contemporary American technical usage, the term *stop* being used instead of *plosive* and the sibilants (s, z, š, ž) being separated from the fricatives. The misleading term *interdental* for (θ, ð) seems to be falling into disuse, and good riddance; the more accurate *apico-dental* is used in this book.

Juncture, stress, and pitch are treated briefly, perhaps too briefly, near the end of the chapter, which closes with a remark-ably detailed narrow transcription of "Grip the Rat", as spoken by the author. Students may find this transcript difficult to fol-low through its forty lines, an experience which will doubtless

convince them of the value of phonemic analysis when they come to the phonemic transcription of this sad story at the end of Chapter 3.

Chapter 3 deals with the "Significant Sounds of Speech : Phonemics," in a carefully planned and generous expansion of the phonemic analysis set forth by G. L. Trager and H. L. Smith, *An Outline of English Structure* (Norman, Oklahoma : Battenburg Press, 1951), "the most up-to-date and compendious treatment of English Phonemics, [which] seems well on its way to general acceptance as the standard treatment . . ." There are, of course, many scholars who do not accept this neat analysis, a fact which, quite rightly, does not intrude itself into Francis' book.

Having introduced the concept of the allophone and the principles of phonetic similarity, complementary distribution, and free variation, Francis proceeds quite capably to draw up the phonetic inventory : twenty-four consonants (including the four semi-vowels /r, w, y, h/), nine vowels, four stresses, four pitches, and four junctures. The nine vowel phonemes, alone or in combination with one or another of the four semi-vowel phonemes, account for the syllabic nuclei "of most varieties of American English". Once again the restrictions on space result in a too brief treatment of the suprasegmentals, especially with regard to pitch. The exposition here might well have been clearer if a few contrastive intonation contours had been included, even at the risk of "mixing" levels of analysis.

Having shown the student the tidiness of phonemic transcription, Francis warns him against jumping to the conclusion that phonetic recording is superfluous or obsolete. In the first place, extensive phonetic recording is a necessary preliminary to phonemic analysis. In the second, phonemic transcription obscures many of the distinctions characteristic of a given language or dialect, for the non-significant phone-types are disregarded. For this reason phonetics is essential to the study of regional dialects, many of the distinctions between such dialects being of a subphonemic nature. This position cannot be too strongly defended: the fieldworker must, above all, be a skilled phoneticist, unencumbered by preconceived notions concerning the phonemic nature of the data being transcribed.

Chapter 9, "The Dialects of American English," deals with linguistic geography in a general way and, in more detail, with the discoveries American linguistic geographers have made in recent years concerning regional speech in the United States. The author of this chapter is Dr. Raven I. McDavid, Jr., an acknowledged expert in this field, who has presented his complex material in a fresh and illuminating way. For my course in linguistic geography last year I found this brief but more than

satisfactory treatment an excellent starting point. It would take a student many an hour reading through books, articles, and dissertation microfilms to get at a small part of the information that McDavid has brought together here. The effect is to make us look forward even more avidly to the book on which he and Professor Hans Kurath are collaborating.

After offering an explanation of the complex forces making for differences in dialect, he outlines the principles and techniques of linguistic geography, traces its development in Germany, France, and elsewhere in Europe, and acknowledges the debt owed by American dialectologists to this movement. Specific attention is then given to the Linguistic Atlas project, its principles, its special problems, and its overall structure. These general statements are accompanied by an up-to-date progress report on activity in the United States and Canada with regard to field work, editing, and publication, a report that is helpfully illustrated by means of a map in the appendix. The impact of this important work is evident from the substantial number of studies based on the Atlas materials. Significant too are the numerous related investigations which have been sparked by the central activity.

The account of progress in Canada is distressing, for little has been done here to advance the Atlas survey: occasional records made at a few border points by American fieldworkers, a few made in the Lunenburg area of Nova Scotia by Dr. Rex Wilson in preparing his dissertation, and the incomplete preliminary survey of the Maritimes undertaken by Henry Alexander a decade and a half ago. It is hoped that Wilson's CLA committee will do something to remedy this situation during the next decade and a half. After all, our colossal ignorance concerning Canadian regional speech can only be lessened by an organized effort to increase our knowledge. The sporadic and fragmentary commentaries which at present constitute the bibliography in this field are quite inadequate, however informative they may be in a limited way.

The bulk of McDavid's chapter is concerned with the dialect areas of the United States (with an understandably uncertain nod in the direction of Canada), the boundaries being determined, at least for the East, by the lexical, phonological, and grammatical evidence available in the Atlas field records. The appendix provides an excellent map showing the principal dialect areas of the Atlantic Seaboard (after Hans Kurath's *A Word Geography of the Eastern United States*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1949) and tentative dialect boundaries farther inland, together with a series of arrows indicating the direction of population movements from the eastern settlements into the central and western areas. Also provided are four maps of the

Eastern Seaboard, each of which shows a number of isoglosses for various items found in the Atlas records, the distribution of these items illustrating in a general way the dialect boundaries of the principal areas and their subdivisions as discussed in the text.

One of McDavid's most striking contributions is his presentation of the evidence for each of the Eastern dialect areas in well-organized comparative summaries, or tables, of selected items in terms of pronunciation, vocabulary, and morphology and syntax. The phonological data are presented, for the most part, phonemically, in keeping with the pattern of the rest of the book. McDavid, however, acknowledges that the decision to follow this pattern was made with some reluctance, being fully aware that the Atlas evidence in itself is not always sufficient for a complete phonemic statement; he is also aware that the Trager-Smith system cannot be stretched to fit all the facts of all the dialects recorded in the Atlas, for example, those of Charleston and other Southern and South Midland areas. Consequently, phonetic transcription appears in the tables wherever "structural peculiarities" and other difficulties "are most strikingly apparent," a marriage of convenience at best. Each of the items listed is also labelled as to social distribution on the basis of Atlas information.

The summary of features distinctive to Canada ("chiefly Ontario") is fragmentary and, unfortunately, inaccurate in two particulars. It is quite inaccurate to say that *won't* with /u/ or/uw/ is characteristic of Canadian speech. Such forms are heard, usually with /u/, quite widely in the Maritimes and especially in Nova Scotia. Elsewhere in Canada they may be heard in certain regions, say the Ottawa Valley, but /ow/ is the usual phoneme occurring in this word. It might be added that /ə/ is occasionally heard on the Canadian side of the St. Lawrence Valley, just as it is on the American side; for reasons explained by settlement history, New Englandisms are often met with in this part of Canada.

Secondly, the one item listed under Morphology and Syntax as being a Canadian turn of phrase, "He lives *in* King Street," is utterly wrong. The responses I have to my questionnaires suggest that this Briticism has no currency at all among native Canadians. As Walter Lehn has already pointed out (*JCLA*, 5:2, p. 90, f.n.1), this misstatement is due to a regrettable typographical error in the table accompanying my article "Speech Differences Along the Ontario-United States Border: Grammar and Syntax" (*JCLA*, 1:1, 19); the text of the article (p. 18) explicitly states that "live on a street" is so uniformly used that the *in/on* choice was dropped from the questionnaire as unproductive.

In explaining the basis for his summary tables McDavid refers to "unpublished dissertations like those of Avis, Davis, and Frank" without further identifying the persons or referring to the nature of the dissertations themselves. This instance of Homer nodding results in a completely pointless reference; it would be better to dispense with the names altogether. I should add that the author has long since been advised of these shortcomings; he has assured me that they will be righted in any re-issues or new editions, a virtual certainty for this fine book.

The Structure of American English contains chapters which we have too little space to touch on: "Building Blocks of Speech: Morphemics," which, like that on phonemics, is a well-conceived expansion of the Trager-Smith outline; "Writing it Down: Graphics," a thorough-going look at an area that is receiving an increasing amount of attention; and "Linguistics and the Teacher of English," a parting word dealing with "opinions, applications, and advice." There is an amazing amount of excellent material in Francis' book and he has indeed "made some of the less abstruse findings of linguistics available to the student and teacher of English."

Walter S. Avis

★

LINGUISTICA CANADIANA

A Linguistic Bibliography for 1959 & Supplement for Previous Years / Bibliographie linguistique pour l'année 1959 & complément des années précédentes[(1)]

I. — GENERAL WRITINGS / GÉNÉRALITÉS

J. B. RUDNYCKYJ & J.-P. VINAY

DAVIAULT, Pierre, "Présentation de M. Jean-Paul Vinay", Présentation No 13, Société Royale du Canada, Section française (1958-59): 79-85.

........, "Traduction", (*Embargo-Evasion*) *JdT* IV. 1 (1959): 59-66; (*Evil-Exposure*), *JdT* IV. 2 (1959): 93-97; (*Exquisite-Extravagant*), *JdT* IV. 3 (1959): 136-137; (*Facilities-Fiat Money*), *JdT* IV. 4 (1959): 169-174.

DAVIAULT, Pierre et J.-P. VINAY, "Le Congrès de Bad Godesberg", *JdT* IV. 4 (1959): 147-153.

DAWSON, MacG. R., "Nova Scotian Place Names", *Proceedings LCMND*, I (1959): 10-12.

GOOLD, G. P., "The Decipherment of the Cretan Scripts", *Proceedings LCMND* I (1959): 19-21.

LANGLOIS, Paule, "La traduction à la section de linguistique, Université de Montréal", *JdT* IV. 3 (1959): 134-135.

LARSON, R. G., "Legal Usage of Common Latin-derived Words", *Proceedings LCMND* I (1959): 17-18.

MANNING, C. A., "English Tenses and Slavic Aspects". [*Slavistica* No 34]. *UVAN*, Winnipeg 1959. 40 p.

MITCHELL, D. A., "Aspect in the French Verb", *Proceedings LCMND* I (1959): 7-9.

PETERSON, R. A., "A Look at one Philological Problem Facing the Modern Translator". *Proceedings LCMND* I (1959): 13.

ROBERT, Paul, "Grandeur et servitude du lexicographe", *JdT* IV. 3 (1959): 115-121.

RUDNYCKYJ, J. B., *Functions of Proper Names in Literary Work*. [Reprint from *Stil-und Formprobleme in der Literatur*. Heidelberg 1959: 378-383.

SAINT-MARTIN, Fernande, *La littérature et le non-verbal. Essai sur le langage*. Montréal, Edition d'Orphée, 1958. 194 p.

SMEATON, B. Hunter, "Translation, Structure and Lexicography", *JdT* III. 3 (1958): 122-130 and IV. 1 (1959): 9-14.

SUMMERS, L., "Present Practices in Translation of Scientific Publications from Russian and Other Languages", *Proceedings LCMND* I (1959): 22.

---

(1) JOLA/RACL I.2 (1955): 19-22; II.2 (1956): 78-83; III.2 (1957): 93-98; IV.2 (1958): 105-109. — Cf. **List of Abbreviations / Abréviations** III.2 (1957): 99.

TAILLON, Fr. Léopold, *Diversité des langues et bilinguisme*. Cahiers de l'ACELF [2e édition]. Montréal, L'Atelier, 1959, 95 p.

TIBÓN, G., "Mexico — the Name". *Onomastica* 17. UVAN, Winnipeg 1959. 32 p.

Université de Montréal: Thèses en linguistique.

— SURZUR, Roland, *Le système vocalique d'un parler breton*. Montréal, Thèse de M.A. Linguistique, 1958. 136 p. Illustré. Dactylographié.

— COUSINEAU-DESJARDINS, Andrée, *Stylistique comparée du latin et du français*. Montréal. Thèse de M.A. Traduction, 1960. 135 p. Dactylographié.

— SAINT-PIERRE, Gaston, *Linguistic Theory in Language Teaching*. Montréal, Thèse de D.Ph. Linguistique, 1959. 224 p. Dactylographié. [Bibliographie 207-217].

VINAY, Jean-Paul, "Répartition linguistique des états", *JdT* IV. 3 (1959): 138-139.

. . . ., "Bibliographie de dictionnaires techniques", *JdT* II. 3 (1959): 142.

. . . ., "Le Congrès de Bad Godesberg" [avec P. Daviault], *JdT* IV. 4 (1959): 147-153.

. . . ., "Bibliographie de la traduction", *JdT* IV. 4 (1959): 177-179.

. . . ., "Discours de réception sur les courants actuels en linguistique". *Présentation* No 13, Société Royale du Canada, Section française, (1958-59): 87-96.

. . . ., *Textes choisis de linguistique*. Université de Montréal, Cours de la Faculté des Lettres, Série I (1959). 44 p.

WHITE, G. D., "On first looking into the Gazetteer of Canada", *Canadian Forum* 39: 80-81.

[. . . . . .], "Geographical names in the Canadian North", *Arctic* 11: 193-4, 257; 12: 59, 124-8.

[. . . . . .], "Linguistic, folkloric, and other field work in Central Canada and the Northern Plains: Results and future tasks", Proceedings LCMND I (1959): 23-25.

II. — *CANADIAN FRENCH / CANADIEN FRANÇAIS*

J.-P. VINAY & G. DULONG

ANTOINE, G., "Compte rendu de René de Chantal, *Chroniques de français*", *FM* 28. 1 (1960): 65-67.

ARSENAULT, Bona, "Au pays des Bayous", *Le Devoir* (Montréal) 10 mai 1959; 11 mai 1959.

BARBEAU, Victor, "La prononciation du mot *Ungava*", *RCG* XIII. 1-2 (1959): 72.

BELISLE, L.-A., "Assimilation et différenciation des canadianismes", *JdT* IV. 1 (1959): 15-20.

BRICAULT, Maurice, "La corruption du français par l'anglais", *L'Instruction Publique* 3 (1958): 366-370.

DABRAY DE LA HÈVE, Jeannot. "The Canadien's French", *CMLR* XIV. 4 (1958): 30-32.

DAGENAIS, Pierre, *Réflexions sur nos façons d'écrire et de parler*. No 1 (Préface de Jean-Paul Vinay) 64 p., Index. Montréal, Cercle du Livre de France, 1959; Vol. 2 p. numérotées de 67 à 125), Montréal, 1960. [Edition avec index français et anglais de la rubrique paraissant dans *Le Devoir*, Montréal].

GENDRON, Jean-Denis, "Désonorisation des voyelles en franco-canadien", *RACL* 5.2 (1959): 99-108.

GRAHAM, Victor E., *"French or Anglais à la Mode"* suivi d'une réponse de J.-P. Vinay "Excuse my French", *JdT* IV. 1 (1959): 25-29.

LEBEL, Maurice, "La langue parlée", *RUL* XIV. 5 (1960): 387-411.

POTVIN, D., "Habitant *vs.* Paysan", RUL XIII. 4 (1958): 340-345.

SÉGUIN, Robert-Lionel, *L'équipement de la ferme canadienne aux 17e et 18e siècles*. Montréal, Ducharme, 1959 [128 pages, 31 pages de planches.]

VACHON-SPILKA, I., "La linguistique au Congrès de l'ACFAS", *RACL* 5.2 (1959): 119-121.

VINAY, Jean-Paul, "Préface" à *Réflexions sur nos façons d'écrire et de parler* [voir Dagenais].

¶ *Dépouillements bibliographiques* :

FORD, A. E., "Canadienne-française" [sic] in "Canadian Literature — A Checklist", *Canadian Literature No. 3* (Winter, 1960): 107-108 [Dépouille RACL; cite les noms d'auteur en majuscules sans accents].

[......], "Répertoire bibliographique; Section X, Littérature, Eloquence; paragraphe 1: Théorie - Linguistique", in *Culture XX*. 4 (1959) [ne dépouille ni RACL, ni JdT].

III. — *CANADIAN ENGLISH / ANGLO-CANADIEN*

WALTER S. AVIS

ALLEN, H. B., "Canadian-American Speech Differences Along the Middle Border", *JCLA*, 5.1 (1959): 17-24.

AVIS, Walter S., "Linguistica Canadiana (Canadian English)", *JCLA*, 4.2 (1958): 107-8.

........, "A Canadian Dictionary", *Inside the ACD*, XI (Nov., 1958): 2.

........, "Canadian English and Native Dictionaries," *Education*, 3.4 (Jan., 1959): 15-9.

........, "The Importance of Pronunciation in Canadian Dictionaries," *Translators' Journal*, III.4 (1959): 21-4.

BELL, Inglis F., "Canadian Literature-1959. A Checklist", *Canadian Literature No. 3* [Language, p. 100], University of British Columbia, Winter 1960.

DRYSDALE, P. D., "A First Approach to Newfoundland Phonemes," *JCLA*, 5.1 (1959): 25-34.

HAMILTON, D. E., "Notes on Montreal English," *JCLA*, 4.2 (1958): 70.9.

LARDNER, John, "Language Here and There," *The New Yorker*, (26 Sept., 1959): 171-4.

LEHN, Walter, "Vowel Contrasts in a Saskatchewan English Dialect," *JCLA*, 5.2 (1959): 90-8

RUDNYCKYJ, J. B., "Sputnik and its derivatives in North American English", *Proceedings LCMND* I (1959): 27-28.

SCARGILL, M. H., "Canadian Dictionary Projects II: Canadian English," *Translators' Journal*, III.3 (1958): 114-121.

SOLOMON, H., "Canada Gets Own Dictionary," *Toronto Daily Star*, 21 Dec. 1959: 7.

WANAMAKER, M. G., "Canadian English," *Journal of Education*, (Nov., 1959): 22-6.

[........], "A New Language: Canadian English," *New York Times*, 29 Nov., 1959.

IV. — *SLAVIC / LANGUES SLAVES*

J. B. RUDNYCKYJ

B.H.S-r "Doslidy nad movoju ukrajins'kyx poselenciv v Ameryci" [Research work on the language of Ukrainian settlers in America], *Svoboda* 101 *Canadian Farmer*, No. 23.

BORSCHAK, E., "Les noms de famille ukrainiens", *Onomastica* No. 18. Winnipeg, *UVAN*, 1959. 16 p.

CHAPLENKO, V., "Pro odnu formu daval' noho vidminku [On archaic Dat. sg. in -u in Ukrainian], *The New Pathway*, No. 97, Winnipeg, 1959.

DOHERTY, J. C. and R. L. MARKUS, *First course in Russian: Part one*. Vancouver-Toronto-Montréal, 1959, 204 p.

E. L., "Tenth anniversary at the University: Slavic Studies", *Winnipeg Free Press*, No. 7.

ILARION, Metropolitan, "Berežhimo svoju ridnu movu i pyl' no navč ajmosja jiji" [Let us preserve and learn Ukrainian], *VK* 12: 5-6.

........, *Naša literaturna mova. Jak pysaty j hovoryty po-literaturnomu.* [Our literary language]. Published by the author, Winnipeg, 1959. 424 p.

........, "Rytmič nist' biblijnoji movy" [Rhythmics of the Bible language] *VK* 7: 3-8.

........, "Rid sliv v ukrajins'kij movi" [On gender in Ukrainian], *VK* 9: 7-12.

........, "Svjati slova pyšemo z velykoji bukvy" [On spelling of "nomina sacra"], *VK* 12: 6-11.

KAY, M. L., "A Soviet view of modern standard Russian phonology", *CSP* 3 (1958) 109-116.

KYSLYCJA, D., *Hramatyka ukrajins'koji movy. I: Fonetyka j morfolohija* [Ukrainian Grammar: Phonetics and morphology], Toronto, *Novi Dni*, 1958. 132 p.

KYSILEVS'KYJ, K., "Nove džerelo dlja studij ukrajinoznavstva" [New source of Ukrainian studies: American dialects], *Svoboda* No. 25 (1959), Jersey City.

MATTHEWS, W. K., "The Cyrillo-Methodian source of modern Macedonian phonology", *CSP* 3 (1958): 1-6.

RUDNYC′KYJ, J. B., "Do Sˇevčenkovoji leksyky" [On Shevčenko′s lexis]. *New Pathway* No. 47.

.... "Pro nazvu "Ukrajina" v anhlijs′kij movi" [On the name "Ukraine" in English], *Ukrainian News* (Edmonton) No. 41.

.... "Slavo-Hungarica. Zur Toponymie der Karpato-ukraine", *Orbis* 8: 158-160.

........., "Ukrajins′ki etymolohiji" [Ukrainian etymologies]. *Naukovi sapysky*, *UVU* 2 (1958): 44-49.

........., "Der Name "Ukraine" im Deutschen", *Südostforschungen* 17 (1958): 175-180.

........., "Slavica Canadiana A.D. 1957". *Slavistica* No. 33. *UVAN*, Winnipeg 1958. 48 p.

.... & Sokulsky, D., *Ukrainica Canadiana 1957. UVAN*, Winnipeg, 1958, 32 p.

RUDNYCKYJ, J. B., in co-operation with Chanal, H. F., Kirschbaum, J., Sokulsky, D., Turek, V., Avakumovic, I., *Slavica Canadiana A. D. 1958. [Slavistica* No. 36], Winnipeg, 1959. 64 p.

SALYS, A., FOLEJEWSKI, Z., RUDNYC′KYJ, J. B. & SHAW, J. T., "East European Languages and Literatures" in [1958 Annual Bibliography] *PMLA* 74. 2 (1959): 317-336.

SHAW, J. T., "The American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies for 1958". *Indiana University Publications* No. 18, Bloomington, 1959. 112 p.

★

SYMBOLES PHONÉTIQUES / PHONETIC SYMBOLS

1 — 10 points

1 — i i	25 — ɛ̃ ɛ̃	50 — ù ù	73 — p p
2 — e e	26 — ã ã	49 —	74 — t t
3 — ɛ ɛ	27 —	51 —	75 — k k
4 — æ æ	28 — ɔ̃ ɔ̃	52 —	76 — b b
5 — a a	29 — õ õ	53 —	77 — d d
6 — ɑ ɑ	30 —	54 —	78 — g g
7 — ɒ ɒ	31 — œ̃ œ̃	55 — î î	79 — ḅ ḅ
8 — o o	32 — ʌ̃ ʌ̃	56 — ê ê	80 — ḍ ḍ
9 — u u	33 — æ̃ æ̃	57 — â â	81 — g̉ g̉
10 — y y	34 — ĕ ĕ	58 — ô ô	82 — p p
11 — ø ø	35 — ŏ ŏ	59 — û û	83 — ṭ ṭ
12 — œ œ	36 —	60 —	84 — ḳ ḳ
13 — ə ə	37 —	61 —	85 — .. .. ..
14 — ʌ ʌ	38 —	62 —	86 — ṭ ṭ
15 — ɣ ɣ	39 — í í	63 — ï ï	87 — ḳ ḳ
16 — ɚ ɚ	40 — é é	64 — ë ë	88 — .. .. ..
17 — ɝ ɝ	41 — á á	65 — ä ä	89 — ḍ ḍ
18 — ɪ ɪ	42 — ó ó	66 — ö ö	90 — .. .. ..
19 — ʊ ʊ	43 — ú ú	67 — ü ü	91 — β β
20 — ʏ ʏ	44 —	68 —	92 — .. .. ..
21 — ɨ ɨ	45 —	69 — ę ę	93 — f f
22 — ɔ ɔ	46 —	70 —	94 — v v
23 — ɨ̃ ɨ̃	47 — è è	71 —	95 — ɣ ɣ
24 — ẽ ẽ	48 — à à	72 —	96 — s s

97 — z z	117 — ʔ ʔ	137 — ʍ ʍ	157 — [ ] [ ]
98 — ş ş	118 — l l	138 — ɥ ɥ	158 — / /
99 — ʐ ʐ	119 — ɫ ɫ	139 — ñ ñ	159 — | |
100 — š š	120 — ʎ ʎ	140 —	160 — ‖ ‖
101 — ž ž	121 — ļ ļ	141 —	161 — ( ) ( )
102 — ʃ ʃ	122 —	142 —	162 — « » « »
103 — ʒ ʒ	123 — m m	143 —	163 — ¶ ¶
104 — č č	124 — m̦ m̦	144 — ‿ ‿	164 — § §
105 — ǰ ǰ	125 —	145 — 'o 'a	165 — ‡ ‡
106 — θ θ	126 — n n	146 — ′o ′a	166 — # #
107 — ð ð	127 — ṇ ṇ	147 — ʻo ʻa	167 — ∘ ∘
108 — ç ç	128 — ɲ ɲ	148 — ˌo ˌa	168 — ā ā
109 — j j	129 — ŋ ŋ	149 — oˇ aˇ	169 — ī ī
110 — c c	130 — r r	150 — oˆ aˆ	170 — ō ō
111 — ɟ ɟ	131 —	151 — o: a:	171 — ū ū
112 — x x	132 — ŗ ŗ	152 —	172 — .. .. ..
113 — γ γ	133 — ɹ ɹ	153 — o˞ a˞	173 — .. .. ..
114 — h h	134 — ʁ ʁ	154 —	174 — .. .. ..
115 — ɦ ɦ	135 — ʀ ʀ	155 —	175 — .. .. ..
116 — ʜ ʜ	136 — w w	156 —	176 — .. .. ..

SYMBOLES PHONÉTIQUES / PHONETIC SYMBOLS

1 — 8 points

1 — i i	26 — ā ā	51 —	76 — b b
2 — e e	27 —	52 —	77 — d d
3 — ɛ ɛ	28 — 5 5	53 —	78 — g g
4 — æ æ	29 — õ õ	54 —	79 — ḅ ḅ
5 — a a	30 —	55 — î î	80 — ḍ ḍ
6 — ɑ ɑ	31 —	56 — ê ê	81 — ǧ ǧ
7 — ɒ ɒ	32 — Ã Ã	57 — â â	82 — p p
8 — o o	33 — ǽ ǽ	58 — ô ô	83 — ṭ ṭ
9 — u u	34 — ě ě	59 — û û	84 — ḳ ḳ
10 — y y	35 —	60 —	85 — .. .. ..
11 — ø ø	36 —	61 —	86 — ṭ ṭ
12 — œ œ	37 —	62 —	87 — ḳ ḳ
13 — ə ə	38 —	63 — ï ï	88 — .. .. ..
14 — ʌ ʌ	39 — í í í	64 — ĕ ĕ	89 — ḍ ḍ
15 — ɤ ɤ	40 — é é	65 — ä ä	90 — .. .. ..
16 — ɚ ɚ	41 — á á	66 — ö ö	91 — β β
17 — ɝ ɝ	42 — ó ó	67 — ü ü	92 — .. .. ..
18 — ɪ ɪ	43 — ú ú	68 —	93 — f f
19 — ʊ ʊ	44 —	69 — e e	94 — v v
20 — ʏ ʏ	45 —	70 —	95 — γ γ
21 — ɨ ɨ ɨ	46 —	71 —	96 — s s
22 — ɔ ɔ	47 — è è	72 —	97 — z z
23 —	48 — à à	73 — p p	98 — ṣ ṣ
24 —	49 —	74 — t t	99 — ẓ ẓ
25 — ɛ̃ ɛ̃	50 — ù ù	75 — k k	100 — š š

101 — ž ž	120 — ʎ ʎ	139 — ñ ñ	158 — / /
102 — ʃ ʃ	121 — ǀ ǀ ǀ	140 —	159 — | |
103 — ʒ ʒ	122 —	141 —	160 — ‖ ‖
104 — č č	123 — m m	142 —	161 — ( ) ( )
105 —	124 — ɱ ɱ	143 —	162 — « » « »
106 — θ θ	125 —	144 —	163 — ‖ ¶
107 — ð ð	126 — n n	145 — 'o 'a	164 — § §
108 — ç ç	127 — ɳ ɳ	146 — ʼo ʼa	165 — ‡ ‡
109 — j j	128 —	147 — ˋo ˋa	166 — # #
110 — c c	129 — ŋ ŋ	148 — ˌo ˌa	167 — ° ° °
111 — ɟ ɟ	130 — r r	149 — o˘ a˘	168 — .. ..
112 — x x	131 —	150 — o^ a^	169 — .. .. ..
113 —	132 — ɾ ɾ	151 — o: a:	170 — .. .. ..
114 — h h	133 — ɹ ɹ	152 — o· a·	171 — .. .. ..
115 — ɦ ɦ	134 — ʙ ʙ	153 — o⊦ a⊦	172 — .. .. ..
116 — œ œ	135 — ʀ ʀ	154 —	173 — .. .. ..
117 — ʔ ʔ	136 — w w	155 — ⦃ ⦄ ⦃ ⦄	174 — .. .. ..
118 — l l	137 — ʍ ʍ	156 — ⦃⦃ ⦄⦄	175 — .. .. ..
119 — ɬ ɬ	138 — ɥ ɥ	157 — [ ] [ ]	176 — .. .. ..

CANADIAN LINGUISTIC ● ASSOCIATION CANADIENNE
ASSOCIATION   DE LINGUISTIQUE

ANNUAL MEETING PROGRAM
PROGRAMME DES JOURNÉES D'ÉTUDE

Queen's University
K i n g s t o n
June 11 - 12 - 13 Juin

♦ **Friday,** June 10 / **Vendredi** 10 juin

    8.00 p.m.   *Executive Meeting* / Réunion du Bureau

♦ **Saturday,** June 11 / **Samedi** 11 juin

    9.00 a.m.   *Registration* / Inscription

    9.30 a.m.   *President's Address* / Discours du Président

    10.00 a.m.   *First Session* / Première séance
                   Chairman / Président : Prof. J.-P. Vinay
                   (Montréal)

                   Papers / Communications :

                   1. Abbé R. Charbonneau (Montréal): "Un aspect particulier des diphtongues franco-canadiennes. Etude expérimentale". (20 min.)

                   2. J.-D. Gendron (Laval): "Etude comparative des voyelles du français parisien et du français québecois à l'aide de radiographies". (20 min.)

                   3. R. P. E. Richer (Montréal): "De l'atomisme grammatical au structuralisme linguistique". (20 min.)

                   4. Gaston Dulong (Laval): "L'extension du vocabulaire maritime en franco-canadien". (20 min.)

                   5. **Discussion.**

    2.00 p.m.   *General Business Meeting*/Assemblée générale (1)
                   Chairman / Président : Prof. J. B. Rudnyckyj
                   (Manitoba)

♦ **Sunday,** June 12 / **Dimanche** 12 juin

    9.30 a.m.   *Second Session* / Deuxième séance
                   Chairman / Président : Prof. M. H. Scargill